DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 741 UD 028 366

TITLE	Minorities in Higher Education: Selected Papers from an Interdisciplinary Conference Held at Hofstra University (Hempstead, New York, March 9-11, 1989).
INSTITUTION	Hofstra Univ., Hempstead, N.Y.
PUB DATE	90
NOTE	123p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Academic Persistence; *Affirmative Action; American Indians; Black Students; *College Students; *Equal Education; Ethnic Groups; Etiology; Excellence in Education; Higher Education; *Minority Groups; *School Holding Power; Student Attrition; White Students
IDENTIFIERS	African Americans

ABSTRACT

This report provides a selection of conference papers which discuss issues concerning minority participation in higher education, beginning with recognition of the many discrepancies between what are expressed as personal and organizational values and what parameters remain hidden. The papers consider the causes for limited minority participation in higher education and review some solutions. Papers include: (1) "Excellence and Equity in the Education of Minority Students" (A. W. Astin); (2) "Cultural Factors Differentiating Academically Unsuccessful Students, Academically Successful Students, and Faculty (P. Chu-Richardson); (3) "Perceptions and Experiences of Minorities at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs" (L. F. Dickson); (4) "Becoming Involved in College Life: A Comparative Study of Black and White College Students" (C. J. Thompson); (5) "Social Welfare Needs of African-American Students as Factors in Retention" (B. W. Emerson); (6) "A Comprehensive Model To Enhance the Academic Achievement of Black Minority Students Attending Predominantly White Colleges/Universities" (L. L. Baker); (7) "Tribal Cooperation in Education Opportunities for Native Americans: Twenty Years of St. Regis Mohawk-St. Lawrence University Association" (R. N. Wells, Jr. and D. White); (8) "An Effective American Indian Social Work Program: Recruitment, Retention and Graduation" (E. D. Edwards and M. Egbert-Edwards); and (9) "The Culture of Affirmative Action: The Law School Perspective" (A. J. Scanlon). Twenty-six papers not included among these selected for publication are mentioned in the body of the document, and the conference agenda, which lists the titles of all papers is included. (SLD)

****

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

****

M Dilworth

ED341741

HOFSTRA CULTURAL CENTER
CONFERENCE

MINORITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
H. A. Robinson
Hofstra U.
School of Ed.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTERDISCIPLINARY
CONFERENCE
MARCH
9, 10, 11
1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD 028 366

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY, HEMPSTEAD, NEW YORK 11550

MINORITIES
IN HIGHER
EDUCATION

SELECTED PAPERS

from

an Interdisciplinary Conference

held at

Hofstra University

March 9, 10, 11

1989

Hofstra University
Hempstead, New York 11550

Lois A. Beilin, Dean
School of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION. i

PREFACE ii

ONE: Introduction and Keynote Address. 1

TWO: Causes. 15

THREE: Solutions 70

FOUR: Finale 94

CONFERENCE PROGRAM 101

DEDICATION

This publication is dedicated to the memory of

SANFORD S. HAMMER

Dr. Sanford Hammer, Provost and Dean of Faculties, served as Co-Director of the Conference, Minorities in Higher Education. His leadership and inspiration provided a creative environment for the higher education community to better serve minority faculty and students. This publication reinforces the conference objectives and will serve as testimony to Dr. Hammer's goal of promoting dialogue on campuses across the nation. Dr. Hammer died one year after the conference on Feb. 14, 1990.

Lois A. Beilin
Co-Director and Dean,
School of Education

PREFACE

A most successful Interdisciplinary Conference entitled MINORITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION has held at Hofstra University from March 9th through 11th, 1989.

Our budget allowed for the publication of only a small number of the many fine papers given at the Conference, and indeed, even these few were edited for reasons of space. Every paper submitted to us is referred to, albeit briefly, in the body of this document; and the Conference Program, which lists the titles of all papers, and the institutional affiliations of the participants, is included for reference.

I want to thank everyone connected with the Conference--those who helped with the planning and organizing, and those who participated in the proceedings. This publication gives something of the flavor of the Conference, in which the recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty in higher education was examined, and recommendations made. I believe that the reader will find this a useful document.

Lois Beilin, Dean
School of Education
Hofstra University

ONE

INTRODUCTION AND KEYNOTE ADDRESS

In the 1960's and 70's the national effort to help this country's poor was called The War on Poverty, but economist Michael Harrington pointed out that it could more correctly be called a skirmish. The participants in Hofstra University's Conference on Minorities in Higher Education, which focused on recruiting and retaining minorities in higher education, sounded a similar theme. Paper after paper referred to the problems caused by diminishing resources: promising programs dropped, fewer students supported, services curtailed. If the war against poverty, when funds were plentiful, was a skirmish, then the current fight to bring American minorities into the mainstream is a minor scuffle indeed, because of the budget slashing, begun in the early 1980's.

Still, concerned educators are attempting to increase the numbers of minorities recruited into higher education, so that these numbers will more adequately reflect the make-up of our population at large. And these same educators are developing programs to improve the retention rate of minorities, once they are recruited. Not an easy task, though one most worthy.

William C. Bonifield writes in his paper:

> The time has arrived, when improving participation of minorities in postsecondary education is a goal on which everyone should agree. It is a given demographic certainty that there will be some 5-million fewer traditional-aged college students by 1992. It is also true that some 82 percent of the entrants to the labor force between now and the 21st century will be women and minorities. No longer do we face a situation in which liberals must persuade conservatives to be more charitable. No longer must a college administration value racial diversity in its student body to pursue minority students. Business does not require a social conscience to seek token employee representatives of minority groups.
>
> College and university administrators lament the absence of minority faculty. They cannot find Black and Hispanic professors to hire who would be role models for minority students. Admissions people cannot find qualified students. Elementary and secondary school administrators cannot find teachers to provide the role models for school children.
>
> Each profession seeks to attract minority students to its graduate or professional school because there are too few role models and practicing professionals in every profession. It is not true that all of the well-educated minority college graduates are choosing law, medicine, and business, thereby shorting academic and other less financially rewarding professions. What is true is that too few of the bright minority high school students are going on to college. Too

> few of this small number of college students are graduating. Too few of these graduates are pursuing graduate and professional degrees and, thus, we have too few professors, teachers, doctors, lawyers, and business people from minority groups.

If, as so many participants in the Hofstra Conference point out, minorities must be integrated into higher education in order for our society to have the sophisticated population necessary in the coming decades, then why are minorities so ignored?

The answer lies, in part, because our personal and organizational values, which cause behavior, often contain serious discrepancies between what is expressed and what is hidden. Alexander Astin, in his keynote address, explored some of the implications of this conflict. His paper follows.

EXCELLENCE AND EQUITY IN THE EDUCATION OF MINORITY STUDENTS

Alexander W. Astin

University of California

During the past several years those of us who work in higher education have been subjected to a spate of reports aimed at reforming our higher education institutions; recently, some of these reports look at issues related to minorities in higher education. Reform in higher education is something that we all like to talk about, but when it comes to implementing what seem like logical reforms, we often find ourselves unable to make much progress.

I would like to suggest the proposition that at the heart of our difficulties in reforming higher education is a fundamental conflict in values--the values underlying our recommendations for reform are basically inconsistent with the values that have governed many of our time-honored practices in higher education.

Most organizations operate according to two sets of values. First we have the formal or official institutional values or objectives, which are usually stated in the institution's charter or, in the case of colleges and universities, in the college catalogue or in the various mission statements. These official value positions are also restated frequently by the CEO and other institutional leaders in annual reports, commencement speeches, and other public pronouncements. These formal or official statements can be viewed as an expression of the institution's explicit values. These are the ones to which we and our colleagues, and especially our leaders, pay lip service.

The other set of values is the one that actually drives the institution's policies. These are the values that underlie major policies and decisions about the allocation of resources, the hiring of faculty and administrators, the admission of students, the establishment of the curriculum, the choice of pedagogical techniques, the establishment of new programs and procedures, and so on. I like to call these the implicit values of our institutional leaders.

I would like to suggest that some of our most severe institutional problems, including those that arise in attempting to serve the needs of minority students, occur when there are serious inconsistencies between our explicit and implicit values. Let's take the kind of place I work in-- a major research university--an an example.

The explicit values of most, if not all, research universities involve the familiar triad of teaching, research, and public service. Universities are usually reluctant to assign formal priorities to these values, although when pressed on the matter, most CEO's will say that they are all valued equally, or that teaching is supposed to be at least as important as the other two. Yet most people who work in research universities like mine believe that the institution's implicit value system involves a distinct hierarchy among the three, with research receiving by far the highest priority.

One obvious consequence of such a discrepancy between explicit and implicit values is that it can be very demoralizing to these people who buy into the explicit value system. I'm thinking here of those professors who are genuinely committed to teaching undergraduates and especially to serving minority students, and people who work in student activities or affairs, or in developmental programs. Such people often feel alienated from the institutional leadership; they may become angry and resentful at what they see as institutional hypocrisy, they may view other faculty as the enemy, they may become discouraged and demoralized, they may feel self-righteous. None of these reactions, of course, is in the best interests of either the minorities or the academic community.

Contradictions between explicit and implicit values can occur in any institution. Even in less prestigious universities, and in small colleges, we often find research or grant-raising being given higher priority than teaching. One contradiction that I see commonly in community colleges, whose explicit value statements strongly support the concept of equal opportunity and proudly proclaim that teaching is the top, if not the only, institutional priority, is that community college leaders really give highest priority to such things as dealing with the faculty union or enrolling as many students as possible. What happens to students, once enrolled, is given relatively little emphasis. Thus, while the explicit values favor teaching and learning, the implicit values sometimes reveal a much greater emphasis simply on keeping enrollments as high as possible. The net consequence of such a contradiction is, of course, high dropout rates, especially among the least-well-prepared students.

The problem with implicit objectives or values is that they tend to remain unstated, which makes it difficult to confront discrepancies directly. Under these conditions, one of the biggest challenges facing us today is how to confront the implicit values that drive institutional policies, and how to effect a better fit between implicit and explicit values.

Arriving at some kind of consensus about our explicit institutional objectives is usually not too difficult, since more institutions have a formal charter that embraces the familiar triad of teaching, research, and service. The really tough challenge for us, I think, is to find ways to expose our implicit values so they can be scrutinized and discussed. One way to begin to do this is to start a campus-wide dialogue on the question of quality or excellence. Most academics are strongly attached to the notion that "excellence" in education is a good thing, and by zeroing in on this, some of these most cherished objectives and values can be identified. Excellence is, of course, the topic in education these days. While we all like to talk about excellence, the real issue is what we do in the name of excellence.

It is here that our implicit objectives and values come into play. For several years now I've been arguing that we have traditionally tended to pursue "excellence" in higher education in two ways. For simplicity I like to label these as the reputational and resource approaches.

The reputational view equates excellence with an institution's position in the hierarchical pecking order that is so much a part of our folklore in American higher education. We can easily quantify this folklore with reputational surveys like the one done each year by U.S. News & World Report. The resource view equates excellence with such things as the test scores of the entering students, the endowment, the student-faculty ratio, and the size of the library. Since the reputational and resource views are mutually reinforcing--having more resources enhances reputation and a good reputation helps to bring in more resources--it is not surprising that both approaches yield similar "quality" rankings of institutions.

One major appeal of the resources view lies in its consistency with today's dominant values. We live in a highly competitive and materialistic society, in which the quality of life and the worth of the individual are equated with material possessions. The various news media devote substantial time and space to discussions of the economy, most political candidates these days stress economic issues in their campaigning, and publications such as the Chronicle of Higher Education regularly print articles and statistical summaries related to the public and private funding of higher education. Little wonder, then, that so many persons equate quality in higher education with institutional resources.

For some time now I've felt that the reputational and resource approaches to excellence are flawed because they do not address directly the central mission of most colleges and universities--the education of the student, or, to put it more concretely, the fullest development of the student's abilities and talents. If talent development is indeed the principal function of institutions, why not define the "excellence" of an institution in terms of its ability to develop the talents of its students?

The talent development view of excellence emphasizes the educational impact of the institution on its students. Its basic premise is that true excellence lies in the institution's ability to affect its students favorably, to enhance their intellectual and scholarly development, and to make a positive difference in their lives. The most excellent institutions are, in this view, those that have the greatest impact--"add the most value," as economists would say--to the student's knowledge and personal development.

Viewed from another perspective, the resource and reputational approaches are manifestations of a competitive view of education, where we see one institution competing with others for resources of students, faculty, and money and for higher and higher places in the reputational pecking order. The talent development approach, on the other hand, reflects more of a cooperative world view, where we see institutions in more of a partnership relationship, helping students develop their talents and serving the community and the society.

Merely embracing the talent development approach, however, is not going to do the trick unless we also know what we can actually do in curriculum, instruction, and student life programs to maximize talent development. As it happens, the research on student development does point to a number of specific things we can do, and most of these can be understood in terms of the notion of student involvement. Involvement refers to the time and energy students devote to the learning process. Higher involvement leads to substantial learning and talent development, whereas low involvement leads to dropping out. Research on student development suggests that minority and disadvantaged students, in particular, could benefit from more concerted attempts by institutions to enhance student involvement. Suffice it to say that if we embrace talent development as our goal, then our curriculum and our student life programs should be designed to maximize student involvement, to encourage students--especially minority students--to devote greater portions of their physical and psychic energy to the educational experience.

I have been talking about different conceptions of excellence for nearly a decade now, but it is only during the past year that I have come to appreciate fully some of their more subtle implications. And, I am intrigued by the ideas that implicit objectives and values affect not only what we do in the name of excellence, but just about everything else that influences our students and the college environment.

EXCELLENCE AND EQUITY

In the past year or so there has been a renewed interest within the higher education community in the status of minorities. This interest has been stimulated in part by the malignant policies of the Reagan era, and in part by the growing realization that the representation of minorities in the system is on hold, at best, and possibly even getting worse. Many of these studies have focused on the stable or declining enrollments of disadvantaged minorities in the system as a whole.

What these studies generally fail to point out is that the situation is far more serious than the statistics suggest, because figures for the system as a whole generally ignore the status hierarchy or the pecking order of institutions, and this neglect masks what can only be characterized as a maldistribution of minority students within the system. Forgetting for a moment the underrepresentation of minorities in the system as a whole, if we look at how minorities are distributed within the system, we find a severe underrepresentation of blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians in the major flagship universities and an overrepresentation in community colleges. To achieve proportional representation of minority undergraduates in the flagship universities of each state, their numbers would have to be increased by between 200 and 600 percent!

Such underrepresentation is especially important, given that the flagship universities in most states serve as conduits to positions of power and influence with state government and private industry. What causes such a skewed distribution of minority students across institutions? Under the resource and reputation views, one of the marks of "excellence" is a highly select student body. Underprepared students are thus shunned by the flagship universities for fear that their presence on campus will dilute or detract from the institution's "excellence." The desire to be excellent thus impedes attempts to achieve great equity.

INSTITUTIONAL "IDENTITIES"

One way to get a more personal perspective about the different approaches to excellence is to think in terms of institutional "identities"; how the faculty and staff view their institutions, especially in relation to the larger society. Although our explicit institutional values usually assert that our educational institutions serve as a means to accomplish societal ends (primarily the education of the citizenry), when a college's identity is defined primarily in terms of the reputation and the resources that it has, that college becomes a kind of end in itself. Institutional "success" is thus defined more in terms of what it has than what it does. At the same time, the institutional energies are focused more on enhancing its reputation within the community than on serving the community. This distinction between means and ends may seem rather abstract, even theoretical, but it has important practical implications for how colleges and universities conduct their affairs, especially for our ability to serve the needs of minority students.

Let's start with how a college hires and rewards its faculty. When the institution's identity is closely linked to its reputation and resources, the recruitment of faculty and the faculty reward system (pay, rank, and tenure) is disproportionately based on research and publication. It is not unusual for a research university to hire new faculty without requiring any substantial information about how effectively they can teach and work with students. These priorities are understandable when having research "stars" on the faculty is a much surer way to both enhance a college's reputation and to bring in resources than can be done by having good teachers and mentors. And when resources and reputations are given the greatest emphasis, faculty in the sciences tend to acquire disproportionate power within the institution, since scientists are in a better position than humanists to attract large resource grants. Moreover, since the scientist's research is usually more visible and more glamorous then the scholarly work of the humanist, the scientist is more likely to contribute to the institution's reputation.

Faculty are treated differently when an institution's identity is linked to its educational and public service missions--faculty are hired only when there is good reason to believe they will be excellent teachers and mentors for students; and effective teaching and mentoring receive substantial weight in the hiring and promotion of faculty.

The treatment of students also differs as a result of different perspectives. Faculty and staff in these institutions whose identities are closely linked to their reputation and resources will be inclined to view students more as resources than as people who are to be educated. Bright students, in particular, will be highly sought after, since they tend to enhance the institution's reputation. At the same time, less-well-prepared students will be shunned because they detract from the institution's academic image and reputation. When it comes to affirmative action and the expansion of educational opportunities to minority and disadvantaged students, I think that it is the reputational and resource views, more than anything else, that pose the greatest obstacles.

By contrast, when a college or university's identity is more closely linked to its educational mission, the quality of student life and the effectiveness of the educational program assume much greater importance. The student, in other words, is viewed more as someone to be served by the institution than as a mere resource. And, the less-well-prepared student is viewed as an important educational challenge rather than as a liability that detracts from the college's "excellence."

Viewing the college as an end in itself also has important consequences for how the institution relates to the external world of legislators, public officials, parents, and the community in general. Except when it is trying to raise money to enhance its reputation, the institution will be inclined to adopt a passive, indifferent stance with respect to these external constituencies. At best, there is the hope that the outside community will be generous but otherwise leave the institution alone; at worst, the interest and possible involvement of these outsiders in the activities of the college will be seen as a "threat" to institutional "autonomy" which must be fended off at all costs.

By contrast, when the institution's identity is more closely linked to its primary educational and public service missions, it assumes a more active and involved role in the community. Under these conditions, the faculty and staff are inclined to see the institution as an instrument for serving or changing the community--for educating the citizens and for improving the condition of the society. The implications of such a perspective for the minority segment of the community are clear.

It is an interesting exercise to consider how thinking about one's own institution can be affected by taking its social responsibilities more seriously. Instead of worrying only about enrollments, appropriations, fundraising, the prestige of faculty, or the test scores of freshmen, focus is shifted to the question of how the educational institution can contribute to solving the problems of the society. Under such a perspective, the college or university ceases to be an end in itself and instead becomes a tool or an instrument for contributing to the lives of individuals and the betterment of the society.

Why have we tended to favor the resource and reputational approaches to excellence? Why has the talent development approach--which seems so consistent with our educational mission--not been more widely accepted and adopted? In large part I think the ultimate answer to this question lies in our world view: our concept of the fundamental nature of human beings and of societies. The more I think about these issues the more I am tempted to conclude that there are two fundamentally different world views that one can adopt in looking at educational as well as societal issues. For simplicity let's characterize these as the competitive view and the cooperative view of human nature and of society.

Some views of American maintain that our greatest achievements as a society are the result of our intense competitiveness and that it is only through our competitive spirit that we have been able to achieve greatness as a society. Well, free enterprise is certainly a competitive view, where individuals are given the maximum opportunity to compete with each other for the largest possible share of the resources and the rewards in the society.

This competitive world view has deep roots in the history of western civilization, but the rise of Darwinism--with its emphasis on competition among species and the survival of the fittest--provided a scientific framework in which to view the development of the human species as a competitive enterprise. In Darwinian terms, the human species was able to survive and develop because we were more "fit" than any other species. This competitive world view, I might add, also provides a basis for what the British sociologist Michael Young called the "meritocracy." In a pure meritocracy, the rewards and the resources of the society are allocated in proportion to the abilities of each individual. "Rewards," in this context, are the social equivalent of survival. The more able persons get a disproportionate share of the resources and privileges, whereas the least able people get the smallest slice of the pie. It might be worth noting in passing that this competitive world view has implications not only for how we view education and the larger society, but also for how we approach international relations and foreign policy.

A cooperative world view provides a vastly different frame of reference. Under this view, human progress and the development of the society is seen as depending upon the ability of individuals and groups to cooperate with each other. The survival and evolution of humankind is seen not as a victory in the struggle with other species or as a conquest of the environment, but rather as a manifestation of our ability to work cooperatively with each other toward common goals and to live in harmony with the environment.

It has become increasingly apparent to me that many of the issues that plague higher education these days can be better understood when viewed in terms of this cooperative-competitive framework. Take, for example, the different conceptions of excellence. The reputational approach is inherently competitive, since it fosters competition among institutions for higher and higher places in the pecking order. And the most obvious manifestation of this competition takes place in the arena of resources, where institutions compete with each other for the largest possible share of the resource pool. If my institution manages to improve its position in the pecking order by recruiting some of your faculty stars or National Merit Scholars, then your position in the reputational pecking order is proportionately diminished. In pursuing the resource approach to excellence, institutions inevitably compete with each other for funding, faculty stars, and students. Even within a single institution, the resource view breeds competition: Academic departments compete with each other over FTEs and other resources, academic personnel compete with student affairs personnel over a finite resource pie, and trustees and administrators compete with faculty for a control over the resource allocation decisions. Claims for a larger share of resources are frequently buttressed by arguments about maintaining or enhancing quality or excellence. In short, it seems clear that both the reputational and resource approaches to excellence are manifestations of a competitive world view.

The talent development approach to excellence, on the other hand, symbolizes a very different value perspective. In this view, all institutions share a common purpose in trying to maximize the educational and personal development of their students. When an institution succeeds in its talent development mission, this success in no way diminishes what any other institution can do. Indeed, institutions can learn from each other by sharing information about their educational successes and failures. Under such a cooperative arrangement, the success of any one institution benefits and contributes to the success of all others.

I am not so naive as to believe that embracing a talent development view will eliminate all internal disputes about resource allocation or automatically solve the problem of the expanding knowledge base; what I am suggesting is that, under a talent development view, such disputes will be less likely to emphasize the competitive mentality of winning or losing and more likely to emphasize the need to find the pattern of allocation that is most likely to enhance student development.

THE ASSESSMENT MOVEMENT

So far I've been talking about the values that underlie our differing views of institutional excellence and how they relate to minority issues in higher education. What many of us fail to realize is that these same issues have tremendous implications for how we approach assessment in higher education. It put it succinctly: the values of an institution are reflected in the kinds of information it collects and pays attention to. Under the reputational and resource approaches, for example, we are primarily interested in input data on the entering student, since their high school GPSs and admissions test scores are viewed as a measure of our excellence. We are excellent merely by having bright students, not necessarily by educating them well. Under these traditional views we might also be interested in output data on the alumni: how much they earn, how many are listed in Who's Who, etc., as another index of our excellence. If our graduates are excellent, then certainly we must be excellent. Under a talent development view, however, neither input nor output data, by themselves, are very useful. Rather, we really need both kinds of data, because what we seek to find out is how much students are actually learning and how they are developing over time.

ASSESSMENT AND VALUES

Lately I've come to realize that these value questions go far beyond merely collecting input and output data and trying to understand how much and how well our students are learning. An equally critical value question concerns what aspects of student development we decide to assess, and how we choose to assess them, for there is no such thing as value-free assessment. Our very choice of measures--our decision to measure some things and not others--involves value judgments.

Take, for example, the familiar dichotomy between cognitive and affective outcomes. Most of us are inclined to shy away from assessing affective outcomes because we think they are too value-laden. College, after all, is supposed to develop the student's intellect, so how can we go wrong if we focus on cognitive variables? But wait a minute. If you read through a few college catalogs, you begin to realize that colleges claim to be concerned about such "affective" things as good judgment, citizenship, social responsibility, character, and the like. Indeed, most descriptions of the "liberally educated" person that I've ever read sound at least as affective as they do cognitive.

In the cognitive realm, I've increasingly come to question our heavy reliance on multiple-choice tests. This is not the place to do a technical critique of this popular assessment methodology, but we should be aware of how our assessment methods affect our efforts to expand and develop student talent. Multiple-choice tests may be efficient and economical to administer and score, but they do very little to enhance student-faculty contact. Indeed, they tend to depersonalize the student-faculty relationship. The same goes for traditional course grades, which tell us little about what students have actually learned. Both grades and standardized tests, I might add, foster competitiveness among students because they are basically "normative" measures which try to assess student performance merely by comparing students with each other.

The more I think about this problem, the more convinced I become that holistic feedback, whether written or spoken, is far and away the most powerful assessment tool we have for enhancing the educational process. Specifically, I am thinking here of the kinds of written feedback that students receive at places like Hampshire College, Alverno College, Empire State College, and the University of California at Santa Cruz. If you have had occasion to see such narrative feedback, especially from the individual student's perspective, you appreciate its educational value. Not only is the feedback informative and useful to the student, but since the process requires the professor to know the student's work personally, narrative feedback strengthens and enhances the relationship between student and faculty member.

One problem with holistic written evaluations of student performance is that they are highly labor-intensive. If professors are going to be asked to undertake such evaluations of their students, what kinds of trade-offs are we going to make in terms of the professors' other job responsibilities? I believe that the best way to approach this question is to recognize that we are once again dealing with a question of values. If we believe that individual students, and minority students in particular, can benefit significantly from the experience of having at least one professor who gets to know each student's work well enough to write a detailed narrative evaluation of it, then what other, presumably less useful, activities can be traded off? Each institution will have to answer for itself, but it seems to me that one reasonable trade-off would be for professors to do a bit less lecturing, or teach one less class. Certainly it behooves us to begin to study the potential efficacy of such tradeoffs.

And what about assessing affective outcomes? I've already suggested that the importance of such outcomes is implied in the explicit mission statements appearing in many college catalogs as well as in the notion of the liberally-educated person. What are some of these outcomes and how can they be assessed? In the area of affective skills we have a variety of potentially important qualities such as interpersonal competence, leadership ability, and empathy.

There are a number of other affective outcomes that seem to be relevant to the goals of a liberal education, although we do not ordinarily consider them to be "skills." These would include self-knowledge and self-understanding, maturity, motivation for further learning, racial and religious tolerance, understanding, of other peoples and societies, self-esteem, social responsibility, and even good mental and physical health.

One affective area that needs more attention in our assessment activities is the student's own values. Our Higher Education Research Institute has been involved in monitoring the values of incoming freshman through annual national surveys for some 23 years now, and what I see happening troubles me. During the past two decades, students have become markedly more materialistic and more concerned with power and status. They are increasingly coming to see undergraduate education as a means to make more money rather than as a source of general education. At the same time, students have become less concerned about the well-being of others, the environment, and the community. These value changes have been accompanied by similar changes in the students' career plans, with careers in business reaching all-time highs in popularity, and careers in the human service occupations reaching all-time lows.

Lately the higher education community has begun to counteract some of these trends by creating a number of programs that are designed to encourage student participation in public and community service activities. The Campus Compact project, for example, is a consortium of some 130 institutions working together to establish community service programs for undergraduates under the sponsorship of ECS. In my own state of California the legislature has passed a law requiring each campus of the university and the state university to establish some kind of volunteer for public service program for undergraduates.

In last year's report to the Board of Overseers, Harvard president Derek Bok said that "universities should be among the first to reaffirm the importance of basic values such as honesty, promise keeping, free expression, and nonviolence...[and] there is nothing odd or inappropriate...to make these values the foundation for a serious program to help students develop a strong set of moral standards." Bok also notes that "students must get help from their universities in developing moral standards or they are unlikely to get much assistance at all."

Our political and higher education leaders are suggesting that social responsibility and concern for others is one of the qualities that higher education institutions should try to foster in their students. Clearly, such suggestions have important implications for how effectively we serve our minority students, but it also has implications for assessment: Isn't it about time to begin introducing longitudinal measures of qualities such as empathy, concern for others, tolerance, social responsibility, and the like into our assessment programs?

Let me get just a bit more personal about this. As I look around me everywhere I see the great achievements of the intellect: atomic energy, genetic engineering, modern agriculture, modern medicine, and computers and other electronic marvels of every conceivable type. It is truly astounding. And at the same time I see the great affective and emotional and spiritual divisions that threaten our very existence: racism, religious fanaticism and hatred, nationalism and political divisions, widespread criminal behavior in the land of opportunity, and massive poverty and starvation in the face of unprecedented affluence. It is time to begin shifting some of our educational interest and energy in the direction of our affective side--to begin concerning ourselves much more directly with the development of beliefs and values that will heal our divisions, and help to create a society that is less materialistic, competitive and selfish, and more generous and cooperative.

BEYOND NARCISSISM

Let me close by returning once again to our different conceptions of excellence. In the long run, our ability to serve the needs of minority students and to deal more effectively with issues of poverty and racism will depend heavily on our values, implicit and explicit, which means in part what conception of excellence we ultimately choose. During my early incarnation as a clinical psychologist I would have looked at the reputational and resource views as basically egocentric, in the sense that they emphasize what possessions we have and what others think of us. (Perhaps "narcissistic" would be even more accurate than "egocentric.") Under the talent development view, however, we identify ourselves in terms of what we do, what we contribute to others and to our communities and society. In other words, by adopting a talent development perspective, we, in effect, transcend out institutional egos to some extend and begin to view our institutions more in terms of their impact on the larger society.

The basic point to be made here is a rather simple one: When an institution exists primarily for its own sake, and when it identifies itself in terms of its resources and reputation, then its relationship with its students and with the society it is supposed to serve becomes exploitative and defensive, and its capacity to serve as an instrument for improving the society is compromised. In short, the biggest obstacle to higher education's serving as a major instrument for societal improvement is the institutional ego. In a sense, our colleges and universities need to learn how to transcend their institutional egos and to become more actively involved in what is going on in this society. The capacity for higher education to be a positive change agent in modern society will depend upon our ability to transcend our institutional egos, our narcissism, and our self-interest, and to concern ourselves more directly with the impact we are having on our students and communities.

I believe that the key to achieving this kind of institutional transcendence is in how we ultimately define our own excellence. Rather than continuing to see our excellence as limited to what we have (resources) or to our status and prestige (reputation), we need to see it more in terms of what we do and what we accomplish. We must begin asking ourselves a whole new set of questions: What are the values that drive our student admissions policies, our faculty hiring and promotion policies, and our methods of teaching, testing, and grading? How much and how well do our minority students learn?

And what about our majority students? How are we affecting their values and attitudes? Are they becoming more humane, more honest, more tolerant and more concerned with the welfare of others? Are they becoming more active and better-informed participants in the democratic process? If we could succeed in persuading our faculty and administrative colleagues simply to begin seeking answers to such questions, we would be taking a major step toward institutional transcendence.

TWO

CAUSES

The statistical data concerning minorities in higher education are dismal. In his Conference paper, Whittaker pointed out that there are more Native Americans in jail than in college. Davis indicated that only four percent of the doctoral degrees awarded in 1985-86 went to minority women, and the actual number has declined in the years since 1980. Panos and Penn note that the persistence rate of Blacks to graduation in higher education is less than 40 percent, and they also point out that at Oberlin, which makes more of an effort to support Black students than many other institutions, 50 percent of Black students receive an Oberlin degree, while 70 percent of all students do so.

According to Amiotte and Allen, among the Oglala Lakotas of South Dakota, who have the lowest rate of life expectancy in America, a large percentage of young people don't complete grammar school, 50 percent of those who do, then drop out before completing high school, and of the small number who attend college, between 80 and 90 percent do not finish.

Minority women, stated Peterson in her discussion of Native American women, have the special problem of facing both race discrimination and sex discrimination. Reed, Busby and Bryant pointed out that in the education profession, a "woman's field," only 1.8 percent of school superintendents are women.

Robertson and McTiernan indicated that the number of minority students in graduate management programs grew in the 1960's, leveled off in the 1970's, and declined in the 1980's--a common theme in these papers. Many participants, including Salters, noted that a smaller number of students will graduate from high school in the next ten years, while the proportion of Black (read minority) high school students will increase. Referring to engineering and the sciences, Salters pointed out that much larger numbers of minorities in these fields re essential if we are to have an adequate supply of scientific talent.

There are many reasons why minorities are so woefully under-represented in higher education. The main reason is lack of money, and this was noted over and over again by participants. A common sentence, with slight variations, is this one taken from Haskin's paper about a Harvard Graduate School of Education program for Native Americans: "Funded by Title IV...since 1974, The American Indian Program was defunded in June, 1987." In this case Harvard assumed partial funding of the program, but too often the end of federal or state funding means the end of the program.

"Financial aid remains the single greatest obstacle for minorities considering enrollment in graduate business programs," according to Robertson and McTiernan; and the finding that minority students report that lack of money is the main reason they don't attend college, and the main reason they drop out of college was heard again and again.

For minority students attending predominately White institutions of higher learning, another major reason for leaving, or considering leaving, is racism, sometimes referred to euphemistically as "quality of life." At Oberlin, which is, to reiterate, a college more sympathetic to minorities than many, Panos and Penn report that the major obstacle to success which Black students cite is "their experience of subtle forms of racism and prejudice." Russell reported that Black students at the University of Washington say that racism is the most serious problem they face.

Educational problems for minority students do not begin, of course, in higher education, and several participants spoke of earlier encounters with unsympathetic school conditions. Chavis noted that young adult Native Americans who attended an off-reservation high school remembered teachers who "didn't know anything about us," who "didn't take the time to become acquainted with us as people," and who "already had their minds set on what type of students we were before they even got to know us as individuals." And Washington indicated that the individual and institutional racism which minority students face leads to lowered self-esteem and the perception of a lack of control over their lives which results in what he terms "learned helplessness."

Tomlinson surveyed administrators at 34 institutions of higher learning in Georgia, about recruiting and retaining Black faculty. Only three of these institutions were Black, and they accounted for at least 50 percent of all Black faculty. She found that over 90 percent of the respondents favored increasing the number of Blacks in higher education. A small group, 60 percent, indicated that their own institutions needed more minorities. And despite the fact that only 9.4 percent of full-time tenured faculty in the state of Georgia are Black, 77 percent of the higher education administrators felt that it was not necessary to change the designation or selection of their search committees, and a majority of them knew of no program at their institutions whose purpose was to recruit or retain Black faculty.

These are some of the reasons for minority group under-representation in higher education

The Papers

Four papers complete this section. Chu-Richardson presents the findings of a study of cultural differences in students, and suggests that those who don't fit the expected mold are usually unwelcome in academia. Dickson's paper indicates the variety to be found within any minority group, and the need for educators to be aware of economic and social differences within groups.

It is appropriate in this discussion of differences within groups to mention that Uwah said, in his paper, that Africans in predominately white institutions are "a minority within a minority," and that as a Black African faculty member in such an institution, he felt that color was where the similarity between him and his African-American counterparts began and ended.

DeFour discussed another intricacy to be dealt with in retention. While isolation of minorities in primarily white institutions is often a cause of stress, it seems that stress can also result when minority members interact with each other--an activity usually thought of as supportive. She speculates that networks of Black students may unwittingly accent stress by talking about, for instance, dropping out; and cites a study of non-minority doctoral students preparing for preliminary examinations as support for this view. That study "found that students in frequent contact with other students experienced the most stress in preparing for the examination. This frequent contact made them aware of all they did not know and heightened rather than reduced their feelings of uncertainty and inadequacy." Such feelings might also result from minority students' exchanges with each other. So, there are subleties galore for educators to learn about.

Thompson's paper looks at how involvement in college life affects the drop-out rate, and Emerson examines some factors external to the institution which affect student retention. The reader will find each of the papers in this section to be thoughtfully provocative.

CULTURAL FACTORS DIFFERENTIATING ACADEMICALLY UNSUCCESSFUL STUDENTS, ACADEMICALLY SUCCESSFUL STUDENTS, AND FACULTY

Paula Chu-Richardson

Trinity College

Efforts are being made in higher education to attract students who contribute ethnic, cultural, and experiential differences. The perceived value and imagined consequences of diversity are lauded and endorsed by those who advocate educational richness and quality.

With all its promised cultural and educational riches, diversity has also brought students to higher education whose views of the world, approaches to learning, and perception of locus of control may not fit with those of the organization cultures of academia. Efforts to diversify higher educational communities are often unaccompanied by the provision of diversified teaching methods, tolerance, flexibility, and support services for students who differ from the dominant academic culture.

Higher education as an institution prides itself on its ability to maintain "standards" of performance (and, implicitly, of culture), and to hold them consistently regardless of the student's actual cultural background. Students who differ from the dominant culture are compelled to conform to its educational and cultural patterns and expectations, suppressing divergent ways of seeing the world and contrasting approaches to learning about it.

"Socialization failures" occur. Culturally different students may find themselves performing more poorly than they or the institution expected. Some transfer elsewhere in search of a better cultural fit. Others continue to apply their view of the world and ways of learning about it to an environment which benignly neglects to reinforce such manifestations of cultural diversity; they continue to perform more poorly than their counterparts whose approach to the world and to learning resonates with that of the dominant culture.

As this study showed, there are measurable cultural differences between the world views and learning styles of academically successful and unsuccessful students. An end result of such cultural differences may too often be reduced chance of socialization, academic survival and emotional well-being for those who don't fit in. It is a small step from such "lack of fit" (Tinto, 1986) to the oppression of culturally different individuals.

BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Higher educational communities are fertile territory for the cultural oppression of students who diverge from the norms of the prevailing culture. Standards and obstacles pertaining to testing and admissions are systematically based on and biased toward white middle class norms (Linn, 1986); Lonner, 1985; Sedlacek, 1977, 1986). Similarly, evaluation of student performance in the classroom may represent "cultural encapsulation"

(Wrenn, 1962) if faculty see cultural differences as evidence of decrements between students' ability level and the performance level reasonably expected from culturally mainstreamed students (Lonner, 1985; Rist, 1970). In the words of Michael Apple (1982), author of Education and Power, "Anyone familiar with recent scholarship on schooling and inequality is undoubtedly familiar with the rapid growth of evidence on how schools act as agents in the economic and cultural reproduction of an unequal society" (p. 95).

Within the American higher educational system, 41 of every 100 entrants to college will leave and not return, the vast majority leaving during or following the first year (Tinto, 1986). The system departure rates for Blacks and Hispanics are considerably higher: 64.6 percent for Blacks and 54.5 percent for Hispanics. Hare (1988) refers to these rates as "eviction rates" as opposed to dropout, stopout or departure rates, affirming the locus of blame as residing in the structure of the institutional culture itself. While private institutions as a group have lower rates of "eviction" or departure than do public institutions, there is a great deal of variation in rates of departure even among highly selective, private institutions. Beal and Noel (1980) found that rates of departure among these institutions is at least as high, if not higher, than among all institutions examined as a national whole, and that rates of departure vary according to the ethos and culture of each individual institution.

For the individual student who has a variant view of the world, the educational process may very well be a particularly painful, unproductive, and disconcerting one. Withdrawal, required or voluntary, may be the ultimate form of defeat resulting from such a mismatch of culture and world view.

Less visible results occur in organizational cultures which are intolerant of divergent ways of thinking. Intolerance of cultural difference deprives students of their opportunity to learn freely, and to achieve academic and personal potential (e.g., Lonner, 1985; Rist, 1970). At the institutional level, cultural intolerance results in wasted resources invested in student selection and admission processes (Lonner, 1985; Sedlacek, 1977). At a societal level, high attrition rates among culturally different students result in losses of valuable human resources (Chu-Richardson, 1988; Tinto, 1986).

At the college under examination, racial minorities tend to comprise a disproportionate 25% of those students who are placed on academic probation, and 30-36% of those required to withdraw for academic reasons, although they comprise only 8.3% of the total student enrollment.

The college at issue may be an inhospitable place for culturally different students, as much as its efforts to diversify would contradict such a statement. The annual Senior Exit Interview Study indicates that Black students have significantly less contact with faculty members than do their White Counterparts (Chu-Richardson, 1986, 1987). Tinto (1986) and others (Astin, 1968; Central and Rock, 1971; Pascarella and Terenzini, 1978) have observed that contact with faculty directly influences students' judgments about the degree of commitment to their welfare held by the institution; these judgments, in turn, result in lessened commitments and goals as well as in a greater sense of isolation from the intellectual life of the institution.

In Tinto's (1986) work on student retention, he observes that poor academic performance is not the most compelling reason for the problem of withdrawal from college. Cultural incongruence and weak commitments to the institution or its educational process are more important withdrawal factors than poor academic performance.

Theories of student departure must be translated into theories of student involvement and learning; exploring the ways in which the experiences and world views of students contribute to or detract from the "quality of effort that they are willing to expend on behalf of their own education" (Tinto, 1986; 380). Students appear to be more willing to expend such effort on their own behalf in an environment and a culture which reflects and nurtures their culture.

In seeking to locate incongruence between organization and individual cultures, cross-cultural literature (e.g., Sue, 1977, Ibrahim, 1984, 1985) and organizational culture theory (e.g., Schein, 1985) call for an understanding of individual world views and learning styles as well as those operating in the culture in which individuals find themselves. Connecting the realms of organization culture and cross-cultural psychology in particular is the framework of Kluckhohn (1951, 1956), who postulated five dimensions for describing individual world views, including perspectives on human nature, relationship to nature, activity, social relationships, and time orientation. Kluckhohn's theory formed the spring-board for both Schein's (1985) work in organizational culture theory as well as the world view research conducted by Ibrahim (1984, 1985) and Ibrahim and Kahn (1984, 1987), who constructed one of the instruments used in this study.

Ibrahim and Kahn's (1984) model divided each of the existential categories into three possible variations, determined by the world view of the individual. The categories and corresponding subdivisions follow: a) Human nature; good, evil, or a combination of good and evil; b) Social relationships; lineal-hierarchical, collateral-mutual, or individualistic; c) Relationship with nature; harmony with nature, human subjugation of nature, power of nature over humanity; d) Orientation toward time; past, present, future; e) Orientation toward activity; doing, being-expressive, being-in-becoming.

Ibrahim and Kahn's Scale to Assess World Views (1984), Kolb's Learning Style Inventory (1985), and Rotter's International-External Locus of Control Scale (1966) allow an exploration of the terrain of a particular academic culture and the aspects of world view that lead individual students learning within that culture to thrive or flounder.

Rotter's (1966) social learning theory molded the concept of internal-external locus of control as a polarity explaining individual differences in acquisition and performance. Locus of control describes the degree to which an individual believes that reinforcements are contingent upon one's own actions and abilities (internal control) versus chance or luck (external control). Learning varies accordingly; the external individual may rely less on personal experience in the learning process, since experiences themselves are seen as random or happenstance. This attribution for success and failure relates to persistence in the face of difficulty. Pertinent to this is the research of Lefcourt (1976) who found that greater internality was related to tolerance of deferred gratification, a quality advantageous in academic achievement, particularly at college.

Inclusion of learning styles as an aspect of culture facilitates understanding of how individuals fit within an academic environment, revealing how they incorporate knowledge into an existing world view. The literature provides evidence of learning styles as a tool for understanding possible cultural mis-matches in an academic setting (e.g., Clark & Halford, 1983; Cohen, 1969; Kolb, 1976, 1986; Ramirez & Price-Williams, 1974).

According to Kolb's (1976, 1984, 1986) experiential learning theory, learning is a process with two primary phases of grasping and transforming. When individuals first approach information, they "grasp" it through the use of concrete experience (CE) or abstract conceptualization (AC). They then rely on the active/reflective polarity to undertake the process of transforming the information, through the skills of either active experimentation (AE) or reflective observation (RO).

The learning process can be thwarted when either the grasping or transforming process is truncated, or when an incongruence exists between the process expected of the student and the style upon which that student automatically leans.

With a conceptual and contextual shift of the locus of responsibility for academic success as being within the interaction between an individual's culture and the dominant culture, we may work toward easing the cultural transition for students, and strengthening the quality of their educational and personal experiences in a particular academic community.

Without knowledge of how differences in world views, learning styles, and locus of control may point to poor academic performance, the dominant culture may more readily justify blaming the culturally different, unsuccessful student for his or her plight. If this is the chosen approach to students who actually differ culturally, the college unwittingly engages in their oppression and punishment. Conversely, knowledge of individual cultural differences nullifies the systemic and defensive response of rejecting culturally different students as intruders, and increases the likelihood of their academic and emotional survival.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study was to understand cultural factors which differentiated three groups (academically unsuccessful students, academically successful students, and faculty) within the culture of a small liberal arts college. The combined dimensions of internal-external locus of control, learning style, and world view (including perspectives on human nature, time, activity, social relationships, and relationship to nature) were considered as dependent variables in data analyses. The independent variables included three groupings: academically marginal students;

students carrying out their studies with a strong performance, and faculty members.

The following hypotheses were tested:

Ho1: There will be no significant difference among faculty, academically successful, and academically unsuccessful students with respect to the following variables of institutional culture: human nature (evil, good and evil, good); social relationships (lineal-hierarchical, collateral-mutual, individualistic); nature (harmony with nature, subjugation and control of nature, power of nature); time (past, present future); activity (being-expressive, being-in-becoming, doing); Abstract Conceptualization - Concrete Experience (AC-CE), Active Experimentation - Reflective Observation (AE-RO), and Internal-External locus of control.

Ho2: There will be no significant difference between academically unsuccessful students and the combined group (academically successful students + faculty) with respect to the following variables of institutional culture: human nature (evil, good and evil, good); social relationships (lineal-hierarchical, collateral-mutual, individualistic); nature (harmony with nature, subjugation and control of nature, power of nature); time (past, present, future); activity (being-expressive, being-in-becoming, doing), Abstract Conceptualization - Concrete Experience (AC-CE), Active Experimentation - Reflective Observation (AE-RO), and Internal-External locus of control.

Description of the Participants

The subjects in this study included 175 students and faculty from a highly-selective, liberal arts college in New England: 53 were from the academically successful (strong) group, 56 were from the academically unsuccessful (weak) group, and 66 were from the faculty. The predominantly male sample consisted of 122 men (69.7%) and 53 women (30.3%). This ratio was consistent among the 2 subgroups of faculty (54 males and 12 females) and unsuccessful students (43 males and 13 females). Among successful students, however, the distribution was more equitable with 28 females (52.8%) and 25 males (47.2%).

The sample was predominantly White (85.7%) with 6 Asians (3.4%), 4 Hispanics (2.3%), 13 Blacks (7.4%) and two "others." The successful students in the sample were almost exclusively White (N=49, 92%) with 2 Hispanics and 2 Asians. No successful students were Black. The unsuccessful group was more diverse: 40 (71%) were White, 12 (21%) were Black, 2 (4%) were Asian, 1 (2%) was Hispanic, 1 (2%) was Native American. The faculty sample contained 2 (3%) Asians, 1 (1.5%) Black, 2 (3%) Hispanics.

Over a third (N=18, 34%) of the successful students were on financial aid compared with almost a half (N=26, 46%) of the unsuccessful students. Successful students were three time as likely to graduate from public (72%) as opposed to private (27%) high schools. By contrast unsuccessful students were almost two times as likely to graduate from private schools (64%) than public schools (36%). Of the faculty, 71.2% (N=47) were tenured, 28.8% (N=19) were not tenured.

INSTRUMENTATION

Three scales were used to describe characteristics of the participants: The Scale to Assess World Views (SAWV, Ibrahim & Kahn, 1984), the Rotter I-E Scale (Rotter, 1966), and Learning Style Inventory (LSI, Kolb, 1985).

DATA ANALYSIS

Given that this was an exploratory study to determine if culture differentiated among the groups, a MANOVA testing for overall group effect was run. Given also the theoretical question of cultural disparity between unsuccessful students in particular and the dominant institutional culture, a planned comparison MANOVA was run with the unsuccessful students compared to the other groups taken as a collective whole.

To localize the differences among the groups appearing through the overall group MANOVA procedure, univariate analysis was run using general linear model procedures (GLM) and post-hoc Tukey Studentized HSD tests conducted on those variables showing significant differences.

RESULTS

A general understanding of the dominant culture at the college upon which this study focused will orient the reader to the world views, learning styles and locus of control which operate in this particular college and from which unsuccessful students may deviate.

The sample taken as a whole gives evidence of a predominantly monocultural perspective operating in this particular college. On the dimension of human nature, all groups endorsed the primary value of human nature as "good" ("evil" secondary, "good and evil" tertiary). For time orientation, all groups endorsed as a primary world view a focus on the "past," followed by "present," with a "future" orientation endorsed the least strongly.

Within the context of this study's median split at a score of 12, the sample reflects the relative internal perceived locus of control which operates in this college culture. The median cut-off point was 12, and the mean was 10.9, with no significant difference among the groups. Additionally, compared with Furn's (1986) data on college and university students (N=378), whose mean locus of control score was 11.70, the present sample is relatively internal in locus of control.

The mean LSI AC-CE score (11.53) indicates a preference within the sample for grasping information through the process of abstract conceptualization as opposed to concrete experience. The LSI AE-RO score (0.109) reflects a preference for reflective observation as a mode of transforming information.

Analysis of Hypothesis #1

A MANOVA test of the hypothesis of no overall group effect analyzed the data. The multivariate analysis of variance was found to be significant (F = 2.09, df = 36,254, p < = .001) by the Wilks' lambda criterion (Cooley & Lohnes, 1971). Based on this result Hol was rejected at p < .001.

Table 1 shows the results of the overall group MANOVA, listing the variables where significant differences were found among the groups. Significant differences were found on the submeasures of "lineal-hierarchical," "individualistic," "harmony with nature," "future," "being-expressive," "doing," and the LSI AC-CE score. No difference was found on the LSI AE-RO score or the Locus of Control score.

Table 1
Multivariate analysis of variance for indicators of cultural differences (world view, locus of control, AC-CE, AE-RO) as a function of group membership

MANOVA		
F	df	P
2.09^{***}	36,254	.0006

Factor	df	UNIVARIATE F	MEANS weak	MEANS strong	MEANS faculty
Lineal-Hier	5,144	3.95^{***}	1.98	2.26	2.18
Individual	5,144	3.63^{***}	2.40^{A}	2.36^{A}	1.60^{B}
Harmony w/ N	5,144	1.90^{*}	1.46	1.32^{B}	1.85^{A}
Future	5.144	2.13^{**}	0.59	0.59	0.40
Being-Expres	5,144	4.68^{***}	1.66	2.06^{A}	1.35^{B}
Doing	5,144	4.36^{***}	1.24^{A}	1.67^{A}	0.62^{B}
LSI AC-CE	5,167	5.95^{***}	6.32^{B}	10.77	16.00^{A}

$^{*}p < .10$
$^{**}p < .05$
$^{***}p < .01$

A,B. Post-hoc test indicating that mean A is significantly larger than mean B.

Group differences on two of the factors ("lineal-hierarchical" and "future") did not hold up under the conservative scrutiny of Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Tests, conducted as post-hoc comparisons on the variables where significant differences were found. Post-hoc tests show no significant differences between the two student groups on the various submeasures, though "lineal-hierarchical," "being-expressive," and "doing" approach significance at p <.10.

Post-hoc comparison indicates that the differences on the factor "individualistic" lies both between faculty and successful students as well as between faculty and unsuccessful students. The faculty differ significantly from both groups on the variable "doing" as well. For the variable "harmony with nature," the difference lies between faculty and successful students, as well as for the variable "being-expressive." Lastly, post-hoc comparisons show that the LSI AC-CE group difference lies between the faculty and the unsuccessful students.

In general terms, group differences are as follows: within the dimension of social relationships, both student groups endorsed the world view of relationships as "individualistic," wherein the interests and needs of the individual are given priority over those of the collective whole. The students secondarily endorsed relationships as "lineal-hierarchical," then "collateral-mutual." The faculty, in contrast, indicated "lineal-hierarchical" as their primary perception of the social relationships (followed by "collateral-mutual," then "individualistic"), indicating a view of relationships as ordered, described by positional status of individuals within a group, with clear lines delineating authority and stressing the importance of group goals (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987). This perspective was in particular contrast to that of the weak students, who endorsed "lineal-hierarchical" less strongly.

With regard to the relationship to nature, each group arranges the preferences differently, and endorses a different priority. The academically strong students endorse humanity's relationship to nature as one which subjugates and controls nature, perhaps reflecting support of current technological efforts toward control over nature. These students secondarily endorse, however, the "power of nature," and secondarily endorse its "subjugation and control." Both groups place least emphasis on "harmony and nature," the preferred mode of humanity's relationship to nature endorsed by the faculty.

Regarding activity orientation, all groups preferred "being-in-becoming," indicating a value towards inner, self-development by means of detachment and/or meditation (Ibrahim, 1984), followed by "being-expressive" (a greater emphasis on emotional expression, followed by "doing" (more focused on action). Strong students endorsed both "being-expressive" and "doing" more strongly than the other groups.

While there was no significant difference on the I-E scale found among the groups through any of the analyses, the unsuccessful students appear to be slightly more externally oriented (mean = 11.3) than the successful students (mean = 10.9) and the faculty (mean = 10.7), suggesting less of a strong belief in their own personal control of the external forces in their lives. This greater tendency toward externality may have implications for the extent to which unsuccessful students learn from their own mistakes, as they may be more likely than the other groups to attribute "errors" in the learning process to luck or chance.

The LSI AC-CE differences between the unsuccessful students and the faculty indicate that weak students are more drawn to concrete experience (CE) as a method of grasping information, while the faculty tend to grasp information through abstract conceptualization (AC).

Analysis of Hypothesis #2

The test of hypothesis #2 explored differences which relate to poor academic performance, with implications regarding the disadvantages of having a divergent belief system and learning style from the dominant culture.

A planned comparison MANOVA test of the hypothesis of no differences between the unsuccessful (weak) students and the other two groups taken collectively analyzed the data. The multivariate analysis of variance was found to be significant ($F - 1.85$, $df = 18,127$, prob <0.03> by the Wilks lambda criterion. Based on this result, Ho2 was rejected at $p < .05$.

The finding of a measurably different world view from the other groups lends support to the overall hypothesis that unsuccessful students have a world view which differs from the dominant culture and which is a factor in their academic performance.

DISCUSSION

The explicit purpose of this research is to understand one particular academic culture and to shed light on the manner in which cultural differences affect academic performance. The implicit purpose is to increase the chances for culturally different students to survive emotionally and to realize their personal and intellectual potentials within a college.

Students who differ from the dominant academic culture may find themselves victims of the "cultural encapsulation" (Wrenn, 1962) of the faculty. Since these students have a different world view and learning style than the one embraced by the dominant culture, their perspective and manner of learning about the world may appear distorted to those who share dominant cultural perspective. The difference in world views and approaches to learning may not be the problem leading to poor academic performance; the problem may stem, rather, from the dominant culture's invalidation of divergent views of the world.

It is essential to note that the relationships among different dimensions of world view are extremely complex, and cannot be pinpointed save for the illusion, however precise, of statistical analysis. While both academically successful and unsuccessful students, for example, endorse an "individualistic" framework for social relationships, this may not indicate that they have similar ways of responding to the individualistic perspective. For strong students, whose individualistic perspective is coupled with an endorsement of "doing," a secondary endorsement of "lineal-hierarchical" and a belief in self-expression ("being"), the result may be a sense of "if I'm going to get where I want to get, and if my life is going to work the way I want it to, I've got to do it by myself." For the unsuccessful student, the same endorsement of an individualistic perspective, coupled with a slightly less strongly internal locus of control. an endorsement of human nature as good and of nature as powerful, yet with less of an endorsement of "doing," may combine to create a perspective which says something like, "I'm in this by myself, and I can't control everything, but things will work out somehow."

Similarly, the faculty's perspective, a blend of a belief in harmony with nature, a lineal-hierarchical frame of reference for social relationships, and an endorsement of the past and of human nature as good, may be one which affirms: "There are certain ways of being which are natural and which have always been. It is our job to perpetuate this legacy through the education of our students."

It seems that, combined with other aspects of world view, the individualistic perspective, as an example, works in the favor of successful students, but does not work in the favor of unsuccessful students. The successful students may be empowered to act upon their world views to fend for themselves, as out of "rugged individualism." The unsuccessful students may have a greater tendency to feel simply isolated.

Unsuccessful students hold a world view that is sufficiently different to distinguish them from the other two groups. The unsuccessful students believe that relationships are inherently individualistic, that nature is powerful and must be contended with, and that self-development is of primary importance in one's existence. The unsuccessful students' endorsement of relationships as individualistic contrasts with the faculty's collateral-mutual perspective on relationships, wherein the needs of the group override those of the individual. The faculty also endorse a harmonious relationship with nature, the last choice of the unsuccessful students, who, as stated, see nature more as a powerful force whose control overrides that of humanity.

Finally, the AC-CE score of the Learning Styles Inventory differentiated the unsuccessful students from the faculty. The AC-CE score, is conceived of as the first stage in the learning process, and represents the manner in which an individual grasps information, either through apprehension of concrete events (CE) or through an indirect comprehension of abstract, symbolic concepts (Kolb, 1984; Sheckley, 1987). The unsuccessful students who score high on concrete experience (low on AC-CE) are likely to benefit from more exercises, simulations, and student feedback, whereas the successful students perform well when learning occurs largely through theoretical readings, lectures, and independent reading.

The data on AC-CE differences suggest that the learning process for unsuccessful students is truncated at the outset; during the initial stage of learning, these students tend to have an incompatible preference for grasping information through concrete experience. The successful students and the faculty, on the other hand, emphasize the process of abstract conceptualization as a way of grasping information. The unsuccessful students appear to be using a grasping process which is dysfunctional in this academic culture, one which looks for and engages with concrete experience, but which finds primarily abstract conceptualizations and theory.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

While the data suggest that world view, learning style, and locus of control differences relate to academic performance and evaluation, it should not be inferred that specific world views, learning styles and perceived loci of control outlines in this study should be used as practical guides in relating to culturally different students. There are certain generalizable patterns, such as the de-emphasis among unsuccessful students on abstract concepts as a tool for learning, and yet the implications of this research are broader and more general than the finding that academically unsuccessful students feel strongly that "human nature is good."

Describing the collective world views, learning styles, and locus of control of the organizational culture examined in this study offers support toward and reasons for organizational change. The present research brings to light assumptions and beliefs under which the college operates; without an understanding of the nature of these assumptions, it is more likely that they will inspire and direct behaviors which may not be conducive to learning.

Given the similarity in the way that all groups transform information (AE-RO), the data indicate that unsuccessful students are not likely to have any more difficulty than the successful students in personalizing information once it is successfully apprehended and taken into their experience and world views. A greater diversity of teaching methods and an expanded repertoire of learning experiences could increase the chances of academic success for those students whose learning styles differ from the one employed and nurtured by the academic culture at the college from which the sample was drawn.

While colleges and universities have strengthened efforts to diversify their communities, it appears that in this particular college such efforts have not been accompanied by a diversification of teaching methods, systems of evaluation, and tolerance for variant learning styles. Crudely put, colleges such as this one may be inviting students who differ culturally to partake in a toxic experience and to accept a greater likelihood of failure. Blaming unsuccessful students for their poor performance by pointing to lack of effort may be treating a symptom rather than the ailment within the system itself. Such a response is all too common in a society whose ethic proclaims that anyone who tries hard enough can succeed, an ethic which ignores cultural, social and political barriers to success.

The recognition of and training in differences in world views and learning styles should be a part of the training of anyone who works closely with students, whether in a counseling, advising, or teaching capacity. To know of the academic and personal consequences of a lack of fit between culturally different students and the college environment and not to have faculty and others increase their repertoire of teaching methods and their sensitivity to cultural differences is to knowingly oppress those who see the world differently from the dominant culture, deliberately reducing their chances of success and reducing the learning within the college community as a whole.

REFERENCES

Apple, M.W. (1982). Education and power. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Astin, A. (1968). Undergraduate achievement and institutional excellence. Science, 161, 661-668.

Beale, P.E. & Noel, L. (1980). What works in student retention. Iowa City: American College Testing Program and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

Centra, J. & Rock, D. (1971). College environments and student academic achievement. American Education Research Journal, 8, 623-634.

Chu-Richardson, P. (1985). Senior Exit Interview Study. Unpublished manuscript.

Chu-Richardson, P. (1986). Senior Exit Interview Study. Unpublished manuscript.

Chu-Richardson, P. (1988). World view, learning style, and locus of control as factors of institutional culture differentiating academically unsuccessful students, academically successful students, and faculty. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Clark, L.A. & Halford, G.S. (1983). Does cognitive style account for cultural differences in scholastic achievement? Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 14, 279-296.

Cohen, R.A. (1969). Conceptual styles, cultural conflict, and non-verbal tests of intelligence. American Anthropologist, 71, 828-856.

Cooley, W.W. & Lohnes, P.R. (1971). Multivariate data analysis. New York: Wiley.

Furn, B. (1986). The psychology of women as a cross-cultural issue: perceived dimensions of world views. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Univ. of CT.

Hare, B.R. (1987). Structural inequality and the endangered status of black youth. Journal of Negro Education, 56, 100-110.

Ibrahim, F.A. (1984). Cross-cultural counseling and psychotherapy: An existential-psychological perspective. International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling, 7, 159-169.

Ibrahim, F.A. (1985). Effective cross-cultural counseling and psychotherapy: a framework. The Counseling Psychologist, 13, 625-638.

Ibrahim, F.A. & Kahn, H. (1984). Scale to assess world views. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut (unpublished).

Ibrahim, F.A. & Kahn, H. (1987). Assessment of world views. Psychological Reports, 60, 163-176.

Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Values and values orientations in the theory of action. In T. Parsons & E.A. Shields (Eds.), Toward a general theory of action. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 338-433.

Kluckhohn, C. (1956). Toward a comparison of value-emphases on different cultures. In L.D. White (Ed.), The state of social sciences, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 116-132.

Kluckhohn, F.C. & Strodtbeck, F.L. (1961) Variations in value orientations. New York: Harper & Row.

Kolb, D.A. (1976). Learning style inventory technical manual. Boston: McBer and Co.

Kolb, D.A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1984.

Kolb, D.A. (1985). Learning style inventory 1985. Boston: McBer and Co.

Lefcourt, H. (1976). Internal vs. external control of reinforcement: a review. Psychological Bulletin, 65, 206-220.

Linn, R.L. (1986). Bias in college admissions. In Measures in the college admission process: A college board colloquium. New York: CEEB.

Lonner, W.J. (1985). Issues in testing and assessment in cross-cultural counseling. The Counseling Psychologist, 13, 599-614.

Pascarella, E.T. (1985). College environmental influences on learning and cognitive development: a critical review and synthesis. Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, volume I. John C. Smart, ed. New York: Agathon Press.

Pascarella, E.T. & Terenzini, P. (1978). Student-faculty informal relationships and freshman-year educational outcomes. Journal of Educational Research, 71, 183-189.

Ramirez, M. & Price-Williams, D.R. (1974). Cognitive styles of children of three ethnic groups in the United States. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 5, 212-219.

Rist, R.C. (1970). Student social class and teacher expectations: the self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. Harvard Educational Review, 40, 411-451.

Rotter, J. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80, (1; Whole No. 609).

Schein, E.H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership: a dynamic view. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sedlacek, W.E. (1977). Test bias and the elimination of racism. Journal of College Student Personnel, 18, 16-20.

Sedlacek, W.E. (1986). Sources of method bias in test bias research. In Measures in the college admissions process: A college board colloquium. New York: CEEB.

Sheckley, B.G. (1987). Experiential learning as a grasping and transforming process. In Rivera, W.M. & Waller, S.M. (eds.) Lifelong learning research conference proceedings, University of MD, Feb. 19-20, 173-178.

Sue, D.W. (1977). Counseling the culturally different: A Conceptual analysis. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 55, 422-426.

Sue, D.W. (1978). World views and counseling. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 56, 458-462.

Sue, D.W. (1981). Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Tinto, V. (1986). Theories of student departure revisited. In J.C. Smart (Ed.), Higher education: Handbook of theory and practice, vol. II. New York: Agathon Press, 359-384.

Tinto, V. (1987). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Wrenn, G. (1962). The culturally encapsulated counselor. Harvard Educational Review, 32, 444-449.

PERCEPTIONS AND EXPERIENCES OF MINORITY STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT COLORADO SPRINGS

Lynda F. Dickson

University of Colorado at Colorado Springs

INTRODUCTION

Two seemingly contradictory trends form the starting point for this paper: (1) declining college enrollment among minority students and (2) rapid population growth within minority communities and declining fertility rates among Whites. Mingle (1987) has summarized the first trend by noting that:

> Despite progress since the days of near exclusion, the full participation of minority students in our nation's colleges and universities remains unrealized. In fact, there is evidence that we are losing ground."

This "evidence" is clear. While 29% more Blacks, and 38% more Hispanics graduated from high school between 1972 and 1982, their college enrollment declined by 11% and 16% respectively. Between 1980 and 1984, Black college enrollment further declined by 10.8%; Native Americans declined by 6.8%, and though Hispanics showed a small increase (2.8%) during this period, they are still the least represented of the major minority groups within higher education (Hodgkinson: 1985).

At the same time fertility rates are higher for non-Whites than for Whites, so an increasing proportion of the school-aged population is minority. In fact, projections are that by the year 2000 one in three Americans will be non-White, and as Hodgkinson has noted, "...minorities will cover a broader socioeconomic range than ever before, making simplistic treatment of their needs even less useful."

These trends will have an increasing impact on institutions of higher learning. A concerted effort must be made now to attract and retain existing minority students, and in the process we may be better prepared for the larger numbers coming through the education pipeline. While colleges and universities across the country are beginning to recognize the implications of these numbers, there is a tendency to ignore class differences. Not all minority students come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, or areas with a high concentration of minorities, and their needs may well be different from those who do.

This appeared to be the case at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS). In order to improve efforts to recruit and retain minority students at UCCS, it was felt that a greater understanding was needed about perceptions and experiences of minority students currently enrolled. It should be noted at the outset that student responses cannot be used as the sole basis for identifying and assessing policy and program changes needed to improve recruitment and retention efforts, or to improve the general atmosphere for minority students on campus. First, students are generally cautious when they critique their own schools; second, most of the minority students on this campus have not come from educational backgrounds characterized by racial and cultural diversity and finally, students have not been encouraged to think about how racial and cultural pluralism might be created or maintained in our schools. This is not to suggest that student perceptions should not be taken seriously.

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY

The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs is an urban commuter campus with about 5,900 students (Fall, 1986). Less than 9% of the student population is minority, though the minority population in the broader community (El Paso County) is 16%. There has never been a strong minority recruitment effort at the campus, and this has resulted not only in small numbers, but a largely middle class minority student population with limited experience in predominantly minority settings.

Purpose

How do minority students perceive their educational experiences at UCCS? What are these experiences? Why did they choose to attend UCCS? Are they pleased with what has happened since their first contact with campus representatives? Could things be better? What could be done to make things better? These and other questions guided our 1987 study of minority students at UCCS. The intent was to use our findings as a basis for prioritizing issues related to minority affairs, and recommending changes that will enhance the recruitment, retention, and educational success of minority students. It was not our purpose to compare minority and Anglo students, nor simply to provide a demographic profile of minority students on the campus. The focus was on the nature of actual experiences of minority students, and what these students thought would make their educational experiences on campus more rewarding and satisfying.

Methodology

Three methods of data collection were employed:

(1) A survey was mailed to the home addresses of each of the 522 students who had checked a racial/ethnic affiliation other than Caucasian on their Fall, 1986 registration forms. The 50-item questionnaire covered several categories of information, including educational and economic background, initial contact with the university, and factors influencing the decision to attend UCCS. The longest section consisted of questions concerning the student's educational, social, and personal experiences at UCCS.

(2) Twenty five in-depth interviews were conducted with minority students selected from a pool of volunteers who returned a postcard which had been included with the questionnaire, indicting their willingness to be interviewed or to join a group discussion session.

(3) Two small group discussions were held in which minority students talked about issues identified as important in the survey and interviews. Participants were selected in the same manner as the interviewees.

Survey questions were mailed to the students in mid-January, 1987. 171 usable questionnaires were returned, providing a response rate of 33%. In assessing the return rate it should be noted that there are limitations to using a subjective response on a registration form to identify "minority" students on any campus. Racial and ethnic identification is much more a reflection of life experiences in which social as opposed to mere biological meanings have been attached to one's racial or ethnic heritage. We found that several students who had checked "American-Indian" on their registration forms had done so because one of their grand- or great-grandparents was an "American Indian." Yet they had never been socially identified or responded to as "American Indian." Given the lack of a "Mixed-Race" category on registration forms, many of the students were forced to identify themselves as Hispanic, Black, or Asian when in fact many had never been socially defined as members of those groups. (In retrospect, this should not have been surprising to us given that in Colorado, 35% of Hispanic, 59% of Asian, and 18% of Black households contain "mixed-race" marriages).

In any event, as we discovered in the questionnaires, interviews, group discussions and the follow-up postcards, many of those on our original mailing list did not consider themselves, nor had they been considered by others to be minority persons. The significance of this is indicated in the fact that the importance of race and ethnicity as sources of self-identification was the most powerful explanatory variable in the study.

A comparison of the characteristics of the survey respondents with those of the 522 students on the original mailing list indicated that females and full-time students were slightly overrepresented among respondents, and Blacks were slightly underrepresented (Blacks were 22% of all minority students, but only 16% of respondents). However both respondents and the broader populations were quite similar in all other respects (i.e., age distribution, enrollment in specific colleges, etc.) and there was no reason to suspect that the respondents were unique in ways that would have indicated serious response bias in the data.

Findings

The wealth of data which emerged from all sources require that only selected findings be presented here. For the purposes of this paper a summary description of the survey respondents will be presented, but the focus will be on student perceptions of their experiences on campus, and what impact race and ethnicity as a source of self-identification has on these experiences.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

The average age of the respondents was 28.5, but like the average age for the UCCS student body as a whole, this is a deceptive figure. Thirty-four percent of the respondents were 22 or younger and 37% were 31 or older.

47% of the respondents were Hispanic, 26% were Asian, 16% were Black, and 5% were "other." This variation masks even greater diversity in the Hispanic and Asian groups in terms of their ethnic heritage and countries of origin.

About one-third of the respondents lived at home with their parents, 43% were living with their spouse and/or children, and 27% were living either alone, with a roommate, or on a military base; over half attended local high schools, and two-thirds were transfer students. Twenty-five percent were graduate students, and 51% were enrolled in the college of Letters, Arts, and Sciences.

Nearly half of the respondents depended on personal employment as their primary source of financial support, 33% depended on spouse or parents, and 21% depended on financial aid.

In addition to these general descriptive and background characteristics we were interested in the extent to which the respondents identified themselves in terms of their race or ethnicity, and the extent to which this identification was perceived as important in influencing their relationships with others on campus.

TABLE 1. The Importance of Race or Ethnicity as a Source of Self-Identification by the Race and Ethnicity of the Respondents

	Importance of Race or Ethnicity a Source of Self-Identification		
Race/Ethnicity	not very important	somewhat important	very important
Asians	28%	26%	46%
Blacks	18%	36%	46%
Hispanics	33%	34%	33%
Total Sample	29%	32%	39%

TABLE 2. The Importance of Race or Ethnicity When Interacting with Others on the UCCS Campus by the Race and Ethnicity of the Respondents

	Importance of Race/Ethnicity in Interaction with Others		
Race/Ethnicity	not very important	somewhat important	very important
Asians	48%	25%	27%
Blacks	36%	52%	12%
Hispanics	60%	17%	23%
Total Sample	53%	26%	21%

As Tables 1 and 2 indicate, while 71% of the respondents indicated that race and ethnicity was at least somewhat important as a source of self-identification, only 47% indicated that their race/ethnicity was important in their interactions with others. Race and ethnicity appeared to be most personally significant and influential for Blacks, slightly less for Asians, and even less so for Hispanics. As indicated earlier, race and ethnicity as a source of self-identification was the most powerful explanatory variable in the study. The perceptions and experiences of the respondents consistently reflected the extent to which they subjectively identified themselves in terms of their race and ethnicity. Those respondents who did not see themselves in terms of their race/ethnicity were much less likely to perceive problems related to minority issues and much less likely to see a need for changes related to minority student experiences on campus.

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE DECISION TO ATTEND UCCS

What influences a student's decision to attend a particular school? Fifty-seven percent of the respondents said they had considered attending another school, and in fact 86% of these had been accepted at other schools, yet chose to transfer or begin at UCCS. To summarize, family ties, affordable tuition, the quality of academic programs and the chance to continue working at a local job were the most important. For about one-third of the students there was no real "choice" involved--they wanted to attend a university, and UCCS was the only one in town.

Additional factors which may influence a minority student's decision to attend a predominantly Anglo campus could be the number of minority students and faculty, special support groups for minority students, and the general campus atmosphere for minority students. As Table 3 indicates, the number of minority students and faculty was not as important as the general atmosphere for minority students. Respondents were clearly concerned about the quality of their education and the opportunity to obtain a college degree.

TABLE 3. The Degree of Concern about Minority Issues in Making the Decision to Attend UCCS

	very concerned	somewhat concerned	not concerned
- the number of minority students on campus	9%	23%	68%
- the number of minority faculty on campus	10%	23%	67%
- special support groups for minority students	17%	22%	61%
- general atmosphere for minority students on campus	24%	29%	47%

Discussions of these issues during interviews, however, indicated that many of the students preferred a more racially diverse student body and faculty, but realized that UCCS was "basically a White campus...", and had no other expectations. Although the survey data indicated no significant differences between Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians, the interview data suggested that Blacks and Hispanics were more likely to express concern about the racial composition on campus. When asked about policies for increasing the number of minority students on campus, 68% of those interviewed were in favor of them, 31% wanted no change, and 1% wanted a decrease. Among Black students, 85% were in favor of increasing the percentage of minority students.

A rationale for not increasing the percentage of minority students on campus was explained in the following manner by an Asian student:

> I don't want the minority percentage increased because more minorities on campus would threaten Whites, and Whites would then give minorities a hard time. If I'm the only minority around nobody bothers me, but when there is a large group it is like a thorn in the eye of the Anglo-Saxon students.

This fear of backlash from Anglos on campus was quite common among the students interviewed: the feeling was most often manifested in the caution which accompanied the desire for various changes. Respondents often hesitated to endorse programs and policies for fear that changes might actually jeopardize the effectiveness of the coping styles they had developed in the existing system.

In response to the question about minority faculty, 39% of the respondents said it was important to them to have minority faculty on campus, 33% said it was somewhat important, and 29% said it was not important. Again, Blacks were most likely to say that having minority faculty was important to them--57% indicated that it was very important.

During the interviews well over half of the students emphasized the need to increase the manner of minority faculty. The following comments are illustrative:

> There must be minority faculty at any university. It is essential for all students to be exposed to other cultural backgrounds through the faculty, and it's important for minority students because you have different feelings as a minority student and it's nice to know someone else has these feelings. (Hispanic female, 25)

> It's the old role model thing--it's important for students to see that Blacks are in those positions, particularly in education. Seeing Black faculty on campus shows students that a racial balance is possible to achieve. (Black female, 49).

> God yes, we need more minority faculty. This institution has a terrible track record for minority faculty. I have yet to see a Black face in an administrative position or in any faculty position. What gets me mad is that they bunch all the brown faces in the counseling department and the library building. Isn't it awful that I have to go to these places just to see a brown face? I need to feel that there's people here who have made it. (Hispanic male, 36).

EXPERIENCES AT UCCS

Students were asked a number of questions concerning classroom and social experiences, and their perceptions of the overall campus atmosphere for minority students. We were specifically interested in the extent to which the students perceived race and ethnicity as being negatively related to these experiences. About one-third of the respondents felt uncomfortable in one or more classes because of their race or ethnicity. This was true for 60% of the Black students. Interviewees who mentioned that they felt uncomfortable in class were generally those whose accents, physical appearance, or behavior led them to be identified as different from Anglo.

A major source of discomfort, mentioned in half of the interviews, was the feeling that minority students had to "outperform" others in the classroom in order to be accepted by Anglo faculty and students. As a 36-year-old Hispanic student noted, "I try to excell in class just to show the "gringos" that Mexicans aren't as dumb as they think we are." A 22-year-old Black woman explained it in similar terms: I've always felt I have to perform better than Whites to prove myself as a student, to show I'm as good as everyone else. And if I fail, I feel I'm failing my race because others will think Blacks can't make it in education." Another source of discomfort mentioned by a few students was the external or self-imposed pressure to voice a "minority perspective" when certain issues were raised in class discussions.

Even though only 12% of the respondents indicated that fellow students responded to them negatively because of their race or ethnicity, about 1 in 5 had been put in embarrassing positions or treated negatively by a faculty member because of their race/ethnicity; about 1 in 4 had felt uncomfortable raising questions in class for reasons related to their race or ethnicity; and 1 in 3 thought it was more difficult for minority students to approach a faculty member outside of class than it was for Anglo students. Also, 1 in 4 students said UCCS faculty were not aware of or sensitive to minority issues, and 1 in 5 said they would feel more comfortable in class if their instructor was a minority person. Asians and Blacks thought they had more negative experiences because of their race/ethnicity than was the case for Hispanic students.

The interview data was helpful in clarifying these findings. None of the interviewees said they were victims of overt, direct racial discrimination while in class. However, there were a few who heard racial slurs or other negative comments during or before class. One student explained that she always sits in the back of the classroom "so people won't talk behind by back; I used to sit in front and talk about my experiences and Anglo students would snicker" (Hispanic female, 35). Again, in general, negative classroom experiences were most likely among those students whose backgrounds, physical characteristics, or use of language led them to be identified as different from the bulk of Anglos in their classes.

Respondents were asked how they perceived their social experiences on campus, especially whether they felt socially isolated, if they felt minority students had more difficulty making friends and becoming socially adjusted than Anglo students, and whether they ever felt "invisible" around Anglo students. Most of the respondents did not have major problems in their social lives on campus. One reason is that many of them had little time to spend on campus apart from time in class. Another reason appeared to be that many of them had come from backgrounds in which extensive contact with Anglos was the norm. When language and/or physical appearance did not readily label them as "minority," students generally blended in with little or no difficulty. Further analysis of the survey data indicate that for those students whose race or ethnicity was not an important source of self-identification, social adjustment was not a problem.

Of particular interest is the question of invisibility. 48% of Asian students, 41% of Blacks, and 26% of Hispanics indicated that they at least occasionally felt invisible. This experience of being invisible was described in a number of different ways during the interviews. For example, a 38-year old Hispanic woman said: "It's hard to describe, but people will sometimes talk past you. Students will talk about assignments with each other as if I'm not even there."

One of the unstated ground rules for initiating interaction seemed to be that the interaction must occur on "Anglo terms." This may be one of the reasons why a number of Asian students thought the best tactic for getting along on the campus was to become assimilated as rapidly and completely as possible. It may also explain why many of the Hispanic students who did not identify themselves in terms of their ethnicity were hesitant about recommending any programs or policies that might call attention to the unique needs or interests of minority students. Their hope was to blend in to what happened on campus, even though the vast majority of campus activities were initiated without regard for the racial and ethnic diversity within the student body.

In terms of perceptions of the overall campus atmosphere for minority students, the consensus appears to be that things aren't bad, but could stand improvement. Only 7% see the atmosphere as "very supportive," but only 6% see it as "not at all supportive," leaving almost 90% who see it as "somewhat supportive." Black students were the most critical and Hispanics were the least critical. Again, further analysis of group differences indicates that those from each group who felt strong identification with their racial or ethnic group were least likely to see the campus atmosphere as supportive for minorities. As one 21-year-old Black male observed: "I don't see how any person aware of his minority identity could feel comfortable after reading some of the things on restroom walls in some of the buildings on campus."

PROGRAM AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS: STUDENT PRIORITIES

The final question on the questionnaire was: "In order for things to get better for minority students on the UCCS campus, what would have to be done? Please indicate the importance of each of the following possibilities." A summary list of general priorities for each racial/ethnic group and for the total sample is provided in Table 4. As we can see, a mentor program and a student minority office were ranked as the two highest priorities. The next three priorities were a newsletter, a dean of minority student affairs, and a more diversified set of social and cultural activities--these were given equal ranking. Those given the lowest priorities were support groups for minority students and awareness training for Anglo students and faculty. However, 75% and 70% of the respondents did say that support groups and awareness training respectively were at least somewhat important in any efforts to bring about constructive changes at UCCS, and 90% thought a student minority office was at least somewhat important. 85% said the same about a mentor program, and between 75 and 80% indicated that a newsletter, a minority dean, and a more diversified set of social and cultural activities were at least somewhat important.

TABLE 4. Summary of Program/Policy Priorities by Race/Ethnicity

Asians	Blacks	Hispanics	Total
Student Minority Office	Social and Cultural Activities	Mentor Program	Mentor Program
Mentor Program	Mentor Program	Minority Office	Minority Office
Dean, Minority Affairs	Newsletter	Newsletter	Newsletter
Support Groups	Minority Office	Social and Cultural Activities	Dean, Minority Affairs
Newsletter	Support Groups	Dean, Minority Affairs	Social and Cultural
Activities			
Social and Cultural Activities	Awareness Training	Support Groups	Support Groups
Awareness Training	Dean, Minority Affairs	Awareness Training	Awareness Training

The interview data generally reaffirmed and clarified the priorities found in the survey data. Most of those interviewed indicated an interest in any programs or policies that would link them in a more integral manner to what was going on at UCCS and in the Colorado Springs community. The support for these programs were qualified in some cases, as indicated by the following:

> I don't know if a minority student office would be used. Many minorities work and they wouldn't have time to use it. But it would be a great place to go and talk. We ought to try it. (Hispanic male, 22).
>
> Having a minority office might not work because minorities are diversified. Like I wouldn't feel comfortable in an office run by a Black. (Native American female, 33).

> We don't need programs that help minority students stand out. They need to be able to blend in with the rest of the students. I know I'm a minority, but I don't want anything that puts me on the spot and says to the world: here is a minority student. If that's what a minority office would do, I don't want one. (Asian male, 30).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Our study of minority students at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs indicates that these students are diverse not only in terms of racial, ethnic, cultural, and national backgrounds, but also in the extent to which they use their race or ethnicity as a source of self-identification and see their race or ethnicity as important in their interactions and experiences with others. Asian and Black students at UCCS appear to be much more inclined to identify themselves in terms of their race/ethnic background than are Hispanics, and they are correspondingly more likely to see the need for change, and to support programs and policies which might bring about these changes.

Group differences aside, it must be remembered that over half of all groups in the sample did not see race as being "very important" as a source of self-identification, and 53% of the total sample viewed race/ethnicity as "not very important" in their interactions with others. One explanation for this could stem from the nature of Colorado Springs which has a large military, and therefore transient population, and includes a comparatively high number of interracial families. It is possible that many of these students are merely responding to an environment that has encouraged them to "play down" their ethnic differences, and focus on the goal of assimilation.

Another possible explanation is that the trend among American college students has been toward a more conservative, "work within the system" approach to life, with an emphasis on getting ahead or "making it." Minority students, especially those from environments such as Colorado Springs, would not be an exception to this rule.

As indicated at the outset of this paper, projected increases in the minority population, combined with lower increases in the minority population, combined with lower fertility rate among Whites, means that institutions of higher learning will probably compete for minority students in the future.

Colleges and universities differ, and so do minority student populations. It will become increasingly important for institutions to consider these differences and to develop diversified programs and policies if they wish to improve recruitment and retention of minority students. Who are minority students, and what do they expect from and experience in higher education? This paper answers some of these questions for one institution of higher learning, and perhaps provides direction for other, quite different, institutions.

REFERENCES

Coakley, Jay and Dickson, Lynda. UCCA Minority Affairs Committee. This paper is derived from a report prepared by the authors and submitted to Chancellor Dwayne Nuzum, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, January, 1988.

Hodgkinson, Harold. All One System. Institute for Education Leadership. 1985.

Mingle, James. Trends in Higher Education Participation and Success. 1987.

BECOMING INVOLVED IN COLLEGE LIFE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF BLACK AND WHITE COLLEGE STUDENTS

Carolyn J. Thompson

University of California, Los Angeles

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to understand some of the similarities and differences in how Black and White students who earn college degrees successfully negotiate their college environment. The intent here is to understand some of the more successful behaviors of those who complete college--particularly for Black students in White colleges. According to theories presented by Astin (1977, 1985), Spady (1971) and Tinto (1975, 1987), students who spend time studying on campus, participating in student organizations and interacting with faculty and peers are more likely to become integrated into the college environment and to complete their degrees. My research interest is in understanding more about the factors that lead students to initially become involved in college life. Do they possess different skills and supports or have different goal commitments than students who do not become involved? This study examines and compares the relationship between student characteristics and other factors related to their becoming involved in college life for a population of Black and White college students. It examines the factors that facilitate involvement as a first step in understanding more about the skills and supports that allow students to negotiate the college environment more easily, and that lead to timely degree completion.

To further understand the success of Black students in different college settings, factors that predict involvement for Black students in predominantly White institutions and in predominantly Black institutions will be investigated. The study is designed to address the following questions: What skills, supports and goal commitments of students facilitate their becoming involved in college life? Are there differences in the skills, supports, goal commitments and involvement behaviors among White and Black students, and Black students on White campuses and Black students on Black campuses?

BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

Looking into the problems related to student retention, recently Tinto (1987) reported that of the students who enter college for degree-credit, about half of them (45%) will begin their college careers in four-year institutions, yet less than half of these students (44%) will maintain continuous enrollment for the first two years. Approximately eight of every 10 (78%) students who leave these four-year colleges will have transferred to other four-year institutions, and nearly 3 of every 10 of these students (28%) will have left the system of higher education entirely two years after college entry. For students entering all colleges and universities, about four of every 10 (41%) will eventually leave the system of higher education without earning college degrees. These rates are substantially higher for minority students particularly if they are in predominantly White institutions (Astin, 1985; Astin, 1982; Cross and Astin, 1981; Suen, 1983).

Studies on undergraduates evidenced Black student retention rates at approximately 50% compared to 64% for White students, and as low as 27% compared to 52% of the overall student population at some White institutions (Suen, 1983); so that in many institutions less than 3 of each 10 students entering college complete degrees. Tinto (1975) has suggested that the relationship between race and dropping out is unrelated to other student characteristics, e.g., high school grades, standardized tests scores, levels of preparation, etc. (the characteristics that are traditionally used to determine college and university admissions). Moreover, studies on alienation and attrition evidence Black students as feeling more alienated than other students at White institutions which leads to their dropping out (Braddock, 1981; Suen, 1983).

In recent years, the overall size of high school graduating classes has declined but the number and rate of Blacks graduating from high school has significantly increased so that Black participation in higher education should also have increased. In 1976, 68% (of 3.3 million) of the Black high school students graduated. These figures rose to 76% (of 3.7 million) in 1985 (American Council on Education, (1987). Declines in Black participation and degree attainment in higher education, however, have reached alarming proportions. The percentage of Black high school graduates entering college dropped from 34% in 1976 to 26% in 1985, 3% lower than the percentage of Blacks enrolling in college in 1971 (29%). During the same time period, with the exception of Blacks, other minority groups earned 1/4 more bachelor's degrees (23%), 1/3 more doctorates (34%), and almost 1/2 more first professional degrees (42%) than they had previously earned, representing gains in degree attainment at every level for American Indians, Asians and Latinos.

The fact that many Black students who attend White institutions complete their college curriculum successfully suggests that information about how they adjust to the college environment and become involved in it could prove useful in developing programs to increase future Black student retention and degree attainment rates. Therefore, identifying the factors that lead to Black student involvement in their attempts to become integrated into, rather than feeling alienated from, others in the college environment is an attempt to unveil some of the successful behaviors of those who complete college.

THEORIES RELATED TO RETENTION

Two theories guided the development of this study; Astin's (1977, 1985) theory on student talent development, and Tint's (1975) theory on academic and social integration. Astin identifies student involvement in the academic experience as the key to the development of students' potential during the college years. Devoting time to study, spending time on campus, participating in campus organizations, and spending time with faculty and peers represent the type of energy investment that facilitates student talent development.

Tinto (1975) identifies forms of assimilation of students into the college environment and refers to them as academic and social integration. To become socially integrated a student must be able to develop friendships with peers and get involved in extracurricular activities. To become academically integrated, a student must be able to identify the academic norms and values of the institution so that she or he can interact with faculty and staff, develop intellectually and get good grades (Tinto, 1975, 1987).

This study is exploratory and will investigate the relationship between certain student characteristics and student involvement. The intent here is not an attempt to validate Tinto's model, but to determine the factors that facilitate forms of involvement, the key component of academic and social integration and of student retention.

THE STUDY

Dataset

This study is longitudinal and uses data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program's (CIRP) annual freshman survey and the four year follow-up survey of these students. CIRP is a longitudinal study of the system of American higher education and the surveys are administered annually. CIRP makes an effort to survey all full-time freshmen entering colleges for the first time.

Description of the Sample

The students in this dataset were surveyed before they entered college in 1983, and again four years later in 1987. The sample consist of 535 Black and 608 White students, with 207 Black students who had attended predominantly White institutions and 328 Black students who had attended predominantly Black institutions. Since the sample of Black students was not a randomly selected group, purposive sampling (Gay, 1976) was used to select a sample of White students from which valid comparisons could be made. The White students selected had attended the same predominantly White institutions as the Black students in the sample. Attempts were made to match students based on institution of enrollment only. No attempt was made to match students based on their socioeconomic level (SES) or level of academic preparation since past research has demonstrated that Black and White students from the same institutions are from different populations based on their SES and level of academic preparation (Nettles, Thoeny, Gosman and Dandridge, 1985).

A comparison of the three groups on their degree aspirations when they entered college in 1983 revealed that the students were quite similar in their aspirations for a bachelor's degree or higher (see Table 1); White students at 98%, Black students in White institutions at 94%, and Black students in Black institutions at 95%. While the percentage of students desiring to earn a degree beyond the bachelor's is similar for both student groups in White institutions (74% for White students and 78% for Black students), the percentage of students in Black institutions aspiring to a degree beyond a bachelor's is higher than for the other two student groups at 86%. This is consistent with the findings of past research (Astin, 1982).

Table 1
Degrees Aspired to by College Type and Race for All Students
(college freshmen in 1983)

Higher Degree Aspired to	White Students in White Colleges (n=608)	Black Students in White Colleges (n=207)	Black Students in Black Colleges (n=328)
No degree aspiration	<1%*	1%	0%
Vocational Certificate	0%	0%	0%
Associate Degree	<1%	0%	1%
Other non-Bachelor's Degree	1%	5%	4%
Bachelor's Degree	24%	16%	9%
Higher than a Bachelor's Degree	74%	78%	86%
Total respondents	531	161	250

* All percentages represent percent of respondents.

Table 2 shows a comparison of the groups based on their degree attainment at the end of the four year period. These data show that White students completed bachelor's degrees at a slightly higher rate, 60% compared to 55% for Black students in Black institutions and 49 % for Black students in White institutions. the 4-year completion rate for Black students here is not indicative of the national norm for degree attainment or retention, nor was it expected to be since the response rate to this type of survey for Black students has historically favored those who have been successful.

Table 2
Degrees Earned by College Type and Race for All Students (entered as freshmen in 1983)

Degrees Earned	White Students in White Colleges (n=608)	Black Students in White Colleges (n=207)	Black Students in Black Colleges (n=328)
No degree earned	34%	42%	37%
Vocational Certificate	1%	3%	5%
Associate Degree	5%	3%	<1%
Other non-Bachelor's Degree	<1%	3%	2%
Bachelor's Degree	60%	49%	55%
Master's Degree	<1%	<1%	0%
Total Respondents	588	198	287

* All percentages represent percent of respondents.

Analysis

There were two phases of analysis for this study. Phase one used factor analysis to identify the variables for the development of the constructs representing skills, supports and goals, and forms of involvement. For the second phase of analysis, stepwise multiple regression was used to identify the predictors of the identified forms of involvement (the dependent variables).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Factor Analysis

In the first phase of analysis, factor analysis revealed three forms of involvement--overall college involvement, involvement in studies, and social involvement (see Table 3). For the purposes of this study, overall college involvement is a combination of the seven variables that represent the student's investment of time and energy in academic and campus concerns, social involvement is a combination of the four variables that represent the student's investment of time and energy towards peer interaction, and involvement in studies is a combination of the two variables that represent the student's investment of time and energy towards their studies.

The analysis was run separately for each group to identify the variables that had substantial factor loadings for each population. Variables that loaded substantially on more than one factor for all groups but that were important to the study were entered into the regression separately.

The three involvement variables served as dependent variables in three separate regressions run separately for each group--Black students on White campuses, Black students on Black campuses, and White students.

Table 3
Factor Analysis on Involvements for All Students
(N=1,143)

% of Variance (37.3)	FACTOR 1 (15.7)	FACTOR 2 (11.4)	FACTOR 3 (10.1)
Overall College Involvement[1]			
Worked on an independent research project	.632	.071	.122
Participated in campus protest	.571	.011	-.169
Guest in a professor's home	.536	.155	-.000
Worked on professor's research	.473	-.024	.062
Hours/week spent using a PC	.469	.071	.090
Received vocational counseling	.404	.008	.025
Received personal counseling	.237	-.137	-.042
Social Involvement[2]			
Hours per week spent in student clubs and groups	.247	.664	.019
Participated in a fraternity or sorority	-.013	.660	.063
Hours per week spent socializing with friends	.042	.636	.093
Participated in intramural sports	-.078	.613	-.130
Involvement In Studies[3]			
Hours per week spent in classes and labs	-.052	.052	.807
Hours per week spent studying and homework	.138	-.008	.786

---

[1] Overall College Involvement is a combination of the seven variables that represent the student's investment of time and energy in academic and campus concerns.

[2] Social Involvement is a combination of the four variables that represent the student's investment of time and energy towards peer interaction.

[3] Involvement in Studies is a combination of the two variables that represent the student's investment of time and energy towards their studies.

Intervening Variables

Results of factor analysis identified five constructs that served as intervening variables (see Table 4). Three constructs representing students' goals were identified as well as two constructs representing students' perceptions of their abilities.

Table 4
Factor Analysis on Student Characteristics for All Students
(N=1,143)

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5
% of Variance (53.1)	(17.8)	(11.7)	(8.9)	(8.1)	(6.7)
Goal: Altruism[1]					
Goals and values as freshman:					
To work in community action program	.754	.114	-.077	.054	-.004
To promote racial understanding	.740	-.003	-.045	.077	.092
To cleanup the environment	.682	-.003	-.040	-.046	-.002
To influence social values	.644	.105	.037	.193	.047
To help others in difficulty	.642	.041	.002	.071	.004
To influence the political structure	.622	.069	.071	.167	.048
Degree aspirations as freshman	.262	.138	.042	.093	-.127
Social Self-Efficacy[2]					
Self-ratings as freshman:					
Popularity with opposite sex	.076	.860	.085	-.012	.093
Popularity	.073	.835	.135	.051	.041
Social confidence	.160	.761	.095	.074	-.010
Academic Self-Efficacy[3]					
Self-ratings as freshmen:					
Academic ability	.019	.022	.858	-.007	-.027
Math ability	-.100	.018	.734	-.144	.035
Writing ability	.037	.179	.631	.146	-.043
Artistic ability	.018	.082	.501	.154	-.065
Goal: Cultural & Intellectual Exploration[4]					
Reason for attending college:					
To learn interesting things	.071	.010	.020	.804	.029
To meet interesting people	.102	.125	.056	.705	-.029
To gain a general education	.188	-.031	.072	.644	.081

Goal: Social Mobility[5]					
Reason for attending college:					
To make more money	.001	.035	-.037	.078	.853
To be able to get a better job	-.045	-.103	-.003	.101	.750
Goals and values to become financially well off	.131	.216	-.066	-.098	.607

---

[1] Goal: Altruism is a combination of six valuables that represent the student's commitment to social issues.

[2] Social self-efficacy is a combination of four student self-rating variables that represent a student's comfort in an academic setting.

[3] Academic Self-efficacy is a combination of four student self-rating variables that represent a student's comfort in an academic setting.

[4] Goal: Cultural and Intellectual Exploration is a combination of three variables that represent the student's commitment to their personal growth.

[5] Goal: Social Mobility is a combination of three variables representing the student's commitment to succeed in life.

I had anticipated different constructs for altruistic and personal goals, yet personal goals were separated into two types; one indicating the desire for cultural and intellectual exploration, and the other indicating the desire for social mobility. For this study, altruism is a combination of six variables that represent the student's commitment to social issues, cultural and intellectual exploration is a combination of three variables that represent the student's commitment to their personal growth, and social mobility is a combination of three variables representing the student's commitment to succeed in life.

The other two constructs represented the student's assessment of his or her comfort in an academic or social setting -- social self-efficacy and academic self-efficacy. Academic Self-efficacy is a combination of four student self-rating variables that represent a student's comfort in an academic setting and social self-efficacy is a combination of three student self-rating variables that represent a student's comfort in a social setting.

Regression Analysis

Social involvement. Results of the regression using social involvement as a dependent variable revealed similarities and differences among the three groups (see Tables 5). For all groups, the level of their mother's education served as a positive predictor, yet for White students parental income also positively predicted social involvement.

For all three groups some form of self-rating positively predicted social involvement. Black students in White colleges who saw themselves as leaders were more likely to become socially involved. For Black students in Black colleges those who had a high motivation to achieve were likely to become socially involved. As for White students, those who were socially confident and who had a high level of comfort in social settings were likely to become involved socially.

Women students were less likely to become socially involved among Black students in Black colleges and White students in White colleges.

For Black students in Black colleges, being from a predominantly Black (minority) high school served as a negative predictor, which is interesting since they would have been in the majority student group in each setting. Preparing for graduate or professional school also serves as a negative predictor. It may be that these students who plan to go to graduate school are willing to sacrifice some social life for later success.

Table 5
Between Group Similarities and Differences
for Predictors of Social Involvement

Population	Positive Predictors*	Negative Predictors
Black Students in White Colleges (N=207)	Mother's education Self-rating: Leadership	
Black Students in Black Colleges (N=328)	Mother's education Self-rating: Drive to achieve	Being female Racial composition of the high school they attended[1] Reason for attending college: Prepare for grad. or professional school
White Students in White Colleges (N=68)	Parental income Mother's education Social self-efficacy[2]	Being female

---

*

[1] Racial composition of the high school is scored on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating an all White school and 5 indicating an all minority school.

[2] Social self-efficacy is a scale that represents the student's perception of their comfort in a social setting.

Overall College Involvement. Using overall college involvement as a dependent variable revealed similarities among the two majority group students (Black students in Black colleges, and the White students), but differences for the minority student group (Black students in White colleges) (see Tables 6). This form of involvement requires a great deal of faculty-student interaction -- working on a professor's research project, working on an independent research project, as well as being the type of student that a professor would have as a guest in her or his home. So it is fitting that students who rate themselves highly on their speaking ability would enjoy this form of involvement. The fact that being from a predominantly Black (minority) high school serves as a negative predictor is quite disturbing especially since many school districts today still have racially segregated schools.

Insight into how to affect changes in this area might be found in the social psychology research on race relations that addresses the perceptions of highly able Black students which affect their performance in an integrated academic setting (Norvel and Worchel, 1981). Effecting changes in students' behavior and performance in this study resulted from having Black role models in the academic setting for the benefit of Black as well as White students.

Table 6
Between Group Similarities and Differences in Predictors of Overall College Involvement

Population	Positive Predictors*	Negative Predictors
Black Students in White Colleges (N=207)	Self-rating: Public speaking ability	Racial composition of the high school they attended[1]
Black Students in Black Colleges (N=238)	Rank in high school graduating class Self-rating: Leadership ability Goals & values: Altruism[2]	
White Students in White Colleges (N=608)	Father's education Average high school grades Mother's education Self-rating: Leadership ability Goals & values: Altruism	

* All variables significant at the .05 level

[1] Racial composition of the high school is scored on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating an all White school and 5 indicating an all minority school.

[2] Altruism is a scale that indicates that the student desires to become involved in activities to improve society and the environment.

For the two majority group populations, the common predictors of overall college involvement are academic rank in their high school graduating class for Black students in Black colleges, and average high school grades for White students, as well as their perceptions of their leadership abilities and having goals and values for social change (altruism).

For White students, the level of both parents' education also served as predictors. This is an important finding because it may indicate that many more of these students grew up in environments where they learned the behaviors for successful academic integration before they entered college, instead of having to learn them once they were enrolled in college.

Involvement in Studies. For Black students in White colleges there was only one predictor of this form of involvement; their average high school grades (see Table 7). This predictor suggests that the most academically prepared students probably took heavier course loads, and were also willing to put in the study hours. In a recent issue of Black Issues in Higher Education (1989), the director of a center whose purpose is to help minority students excel in a large university, noted that most of the Black and Latino students at his university were used to working many hours independently, but that they greatly benefitted from programs that called for collaborative efforts (O'Brien, 1989). In this study on involvement we are unable to determine whether their time was spent working independently or collaboratively, so that this is something else for those of you who work closely with students, to consider.

For Black students in Black colleges, being from a predominantly Black (minority) neighborhood and wanting to improve social conditions also served as positive predictors of involvement in studies. Altruism also served as a predictor for overall college involvement. For this population, selection of a college may have been partially based on attending an institution with goals and values similar to their own. These institutions have produced leaders that have participated in as well as initiated community action programs, promoted racial understanding, influenced social values as well as political structure, and helped people in difficulty.

Table 7
Between Group Similarities and Differences for Predictors of Involvement in Studies

Population	Positive Predictors*	Negative Predictors
Black Students in White Colleges (N=207)	Average high school grades	
Black Students in Black Colleges (N=328)	Academic rank in high school graduating class Parental income Racial composition of the neighborhood where they grew up[1] Goals & values: Altruism[2]	
White Students in White Colleges (N=608)	Academic rank in high school graduating class Being male Parental income Academic self-efficacy[3]	Self-rating: Public speaking ability

[*] All variables significant at the .05 level.
[1] Racial composition of the neighborhood is scored on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating an all White school and 5 indicating an all minority school.
[2] Altruism is a scale that indicates that the student desires to become involved in activities to improve society and the environment.
[3] Academic self-efficacy is a scale representing the student's perception of their comfort in an academic setting.

The two groups of majority students had two positive predictors in common; their academic rank in their high school graduating class and parental income. For the White students, men were more involved in their studies than women, and students' level of comfort and feelings that they would do well in an academic setting (academic self-efficacy) also served as positive predictors of involvement in studies. Students' feelings about their public speaking ability, however, served as a negative predictor which suggest that this form of involvement is easier for this type of student because it does not require verbal skills.

CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

One of the limitations of this study is the small sample of Black students in White institutions. That there were few predictors for each form of involvement may have been a result of the sample size, so that with a larger group we will, hopefully, learn even more about this group.

The study has, however, contributed to our knowledge of what factors may facilitate forms of involvement for each student group. In Tinto's (1987) model of student attrition, he talks about the role of goal commitments as they relate to academic integration and student retention. Yet, Tinto talks only about the goal of college completion, measured in terms of either educational plans, educational expectations or career expectations (Tinto, 1975). The role of altruism as a goal and value of students had not yet been considered.

From this study, we can see that altruism serves as a predictor of two forms of involvement for Black students in Black colleges--college studies and overall college involvement--as well as a predictor for White students' overall college involvement. Since academic involvement and integration are important to the development of students' potentials (Astin, 1985), and since the role of altruism (goals and values for social change) in predicting involvement has been demonstrated here, then perhaps institutions should learn more about the goals and values of the minority populations they serve, and take these differences, should they exist, into consideration when working with or developing programs for minority students.

REFERENCES

American Council on Education, Commission on Minorities in Higher Education. (187). Sixth annual status report: Minorities in higher education. American Council on Education, Office of Minority Concerns.

Astin, A.W. (1975). Preventing students from dropping out. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Astin, A.W. (1977). Four critical years. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass Publisher.

Astin, A.W. (1982). Minorities in American higher education. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Astin, A.W., (1985). Achieving educational excellence. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Beal, P., & Noel, L. (1979). What works in student retention. Iowa City, IA.: American College Testing Program and Boulder, CO.: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

Boyd, W.M. (1974). Desegregating America's colleges: A nationwide survey of Black students, 1972-73. New York, NY.: Praeger Publishers.

Boyd, W.M. (19820. The secret of minority retention. AGB Reports, 24(2), 17-21.

Braddock, J.H.,II. (1981). Desegregation and Black student attrition. Urban Education, 15(4), 403-418.

Carter-Williams, M. (1984). Student enrollment trends in Black colleges: Past, current, and future perspectives. In A.Garibaldi (ed.), Black Colleges and Universities: Challenges for the Future. New York, NY.: Praeger Publishers.

Clewell, B. (1984, September). Identification of institutions with good minority retention practices: A feasibility study (Final Report).

Clewell, B., & Ficklen, M. (1986, June). Improving minority retention in higher education: A search for effective institutional practices (Research Report). Princeton, NJ.: Educational Testing Service.

Cross, P., & Astin, H. (1981). Factors affecting Black students' retention. New Directions for Student Services, 3, 29-35.

Donovan, R. (1984). Path analysis of a theoretical model of persistence in higher education among low-income Black youth. Research in Higher Education, 21(3), 243-256.

Fleming, J. (1985). Blacks in college: A comparative study of students' success in Black and White institutions. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gamson, Z. (1978). Programs for Black students, 1968-1974. In M.W. Peterson et al. (Eds.), Black students on White campuses: The impact of increased Black enrollments. Ann Arbor, MI.: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.

Gay, L.R. (1981). Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Gibbs, J.T. (1974). Patterns of adaption among Black students at a predominantly White university. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 44, 728-740.

Grafton, T.H. (1964). An attitude scale on accepting Negro students. Social Forces, 43(1), 38-41.

Graham, S. (1988). Can attribution theory tell us something about motivation in Blacks? Educational Psychologists, 23(1), 3-21.

Greeley, A.M. & Sheatley, P.B. (1971). Attitudes towards racial integration. Scientific American, 225(6), 13-19.

Lewis, J.J., (1986). The Black freshman network. College and University, 135-140.

Merritt, R. (1983). Comparison of tolerance of White graduates of racially integrated and racially segregated schools. Adolescence, 18(69), 67-70.

Nettles, M.T., Thoeny, A.R., Gosman, E.J., Dandridge, B.A. (1985). The causes and consequences of college students' performance: A focus on Black and White students' attrition rates, progression rates and grade point averages. Tennessee: Tennessee Higher Education Commission.

Norvel, N. & Worchel, S. (1981). A reexamination of the relation between equal status contact and intergroup attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41(5), 902-908.

O'Brien, E. (1989). Berkely model proves successful for Blacks', Hispanics' calculus performance. Black Issues in Higher Education, 5(1), 1.

Oliver, M., Rodriguez, C., & Mickelson, R. (1985). Brown and Black in White. The social adjustments of Chicano and Black students in a predominantly White university. The Urban Review, 17(1), 3-24.

Pascarella, E.T., & Chapman, D.W. (1983). A multiinstitutional, path analytic validation of Tinto's model of college withdrawal. American Educational Research Journal, 20(1), 87-102.

Pascarella, E.T., Duby, P., & Iverson, B.K. (1983). A test and reconceptualization of a theoretical model of college withdrawal in a commuter institution setting. Sociology of Education, 56, 88-100.

Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (1979). Interaction effects in Spady's and Tinto's conceptual models of college dropout. Sociology of Education, 52, 197-210.

Perry, F. (1981). Factors affecting academic performance and persistence among Mexican-American, Black and Anglo students. College Student Journal, 15(1), 53-62.

Peterson, M., Blackburn, R., Gamson, Z., Arce, C., Davenport, R., & Mingle, J. (1978). Black students on White campuses: The impact of increased black enrollments. Ann Arbor, MI.: University of Michigan.

Preer, J.L. (1982). Lawyers v. educators: Black colleges and desegregation in public higher education. Westport, CT.: Greenwood Press.

Ravitch, D. (1983). The troubled crusade: American education, 1945-1980. New York, NY.: Basic Books, Inc.

Richardson, R., & Bender, L. (19870. Fostering minority student access and achievement in higher education. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sedlacek, W.E. (1987). Black students on White campuses: 20 years of research. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28(6), 484-495.

Selltiz, C., Edrich, H., Cook, S.W. (1965). Ratings of favorableness of statements about a racial group. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *2*, 408-415.

Shavelson, R. (1981). *Statistical reasoning for the behavioral sciences*. Boston, MA.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Spady, W.G. (1971). Dropouts from higher education: Toward an empirical model. *Interchange*, *2*(3), 38-62.

Suen, H.K. (1983). Alienation and attrition of Black college students on a predominantly White campus. *Journal of college Student Personnel*, *24*(2), 117-121.

Terenzini, P.T., & Pascarella, E.T. (1980). Toward the validation of Tinto's model of college student attrition: A review of recent studies. *Research in Higher Education*, *12*(3), 271-282.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, *45*(1), 89-125.

Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago, IL.: University of Chicago Press.

Tracey, T., Sedlacek, W. (1985). *The relationship of noncognitive variables to academic success: A longitudinal comparison by race*. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 405-410.

SOCIAL WELFARE NEEDS OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN AS FACTORS IN RETENTION

Barbara V. Emerson

City University of New York

INTRODUCTION

Three types of studies predominate in a review of the research literature on student retention in higher education. The first approach has traditionally utilized background variables--high school grades and/or rank, SAT scores, parents' educational level, socio-economic status, etc.--to predict academic success.[1] Although these variables have been accepted as predictors of retention, more recent multivariate analyses and longitudinal studies have revealed that when aggregated, these variables often do not account for more than 10 to 15% of the variance in persistence.[2] A second approach to retention has been the attempt to understand personality and attitudinal characteristics associated with success. The focus of these studies has been on the non-cognitive differences between those who succeed and those who do not.[3] The third, most recent, approach has been to examine the fit between the student and the institution. This conceptual framework suggests that the life experiences of students after entering college are more important to the understanding of persistence than characteristics they bring to the institution.[4]

The approach of the study reported here is to expand upon the latter group of formulations by examining life experiences of students after entering college that are external to their academic experiences. The Ecological Perspective common to Student Personnel Work and Social Work provides the theoretical base. This perspective views the person and the total environment as a unitary, interacting system.[5] Utilizing this perspective, this study attempts to broaden the limited vision of the environment used in other retention studies to include factors beyond the academic setting: health, housing, employment, social services, and income maintenance. By examining these Social Welfare factors, this research sought to explore the relationship between retention and non-educational needs in order to extend our knowledge of the retention of African-American students.

METHOD

The research presented in this report was a survey conducted following the Spring 1987 semester at the City University of New York (CUNY). Participants consisted of students who were admitted to Queens College in September 1985 as Search for Education, Elevation and Knowledge Program (SEEK) students and who were still enrolled four semesters after matriculation. This cohort was selected based upon prior research by the CUNY Office of Special Programs which identified the fourth semester of matriculation as critical to retention.[6]

The SEEK Program is an educational opportunity program in its twentieth year at CUNY. Mandated by the New York State Legislature to provide access to

CUNY for those who ordinarily would not be admitted, the SEEK program waives standard CUNY admissions criteria for educationally and economically disadvantaged students. All participants enter with high school averages below 80% and come from households with gross incomes near or below the poverty line. The study therefore carries out Vincent Tinto's position that retention among disadvantaged students requires further exploration.[7]

Sample

A September 13, 1985 computerized list of new Queens College SEEK students was used to identify the members of the cohort that constitutes the sample. The names of the 195 freshmen who entered in Fall 1985 were submitted to the Queens College Information Systems Office for verification of Spring 1987 registration. One hundred twenty-four students or 64% of the original cohort were identified as currently registered. The drop-out rate of the cohort (36%) thus approaches the national average of 40%.

The "SEEK Retention Research Questionnaire" was mailed to all 124 students. The initial mailing and a second-wave yielded only 25 responses. In order to increase the response rate, it was necessary for the Investigator to contact non-respondents by telephone. With the cooperation of SEEK Counselors, who provided phone numbers for the vast majority of initial non-respondents, 57 additional students were surveyed by telephone. In the telephone interviews, the mailed questionnaire was strictly adhered to in soliciting responses.

The sample therefore consisted of 82 CUNY students admitted through the SEEK Program in September 1985 who were still retained four semesters after matriculation. African Americans accounted for 37% of the total sample. This sub-group had a higher representation of females (62.1%) than the total sample (54.9%). These students also tended to be somewhat older than the traditional college age of the sample with 28% being 21 years or older. Although the vast majority (82%) were single, twice as many African American respondents were married and/or had children. Only half of the African American students were first generation college students as compared to two-thirds of the total sample.

The ethnic breakdown of the total sample was as follows:

Black	36.7%
White	13.9%
Puerto Rican	8.9%
Other Hispanic	19.0%
Asian	13.9%
Other	7.6%

The ethnic breakdown of the sample indicates that the Queens College SEEK Program which was initially an African-American and Puerto Rican program now services other ethnic-group students, who together accounted for less than half of the sample.

The "SEEK Retention Research Questionnaire" employed in this study is an original instrument designed by the Investigator under a grant from the CUNY Office of Special Programs. An exhaustive literature search and extensive contact with practitioners and experts in Retention Research, Student Personnel Work, and Social Welfare failed to uncover an instrument that would assess individual students' needs in Social Welfare area. Retention research, as discussed in the Introduction has never focused on these factors. Student Personnel Work has concentrated on academic and psychological variables. The Social Welfare system is an eligibility-driven system that bases need-assessment on funding stream criteria. Indeed, no such instrument and few normative measures in the areas under investigation could be located.

ANALYSIS

The research herein described was designed to explore two questions:

1. What are the Social Welfare needs of African-American Students?
2. What is the relationship between Social Welfare levels of need and retention/achievement.

Thus, the analyses consisted of two sets of analysis.

The construct "need" was operationally defined by the occurrence and frequency of problems and disruptive life experiences in the areas of concern: the five Social Welfare scales of health, housing, employment, social services and income maintenance. Frequency counts, percentages and univariate statistics were generated for these variables for total and by ethnicity.

The second set of analyses examined the relationship between the level of need and retention/achievement. The five Social Welfare scales were correlated with both Retention and Achievement variables. Additionally the five Social Welfare scales were used to compute a cumulative Social Welfare score that measured the subjects' overall level of need. The construct "level" was operationalized by standardizing and summing the scores of the five initial scales. This procedure was used to prevent the disproportionate contribution to the overall Social Welfare level score by scales of unequal item composition.

Achievement was operationally defined by the following variables:

1. Cumulative credits attained
2. Cumulative grade point average
3. Academic standing

Retention was measured by the following variables occurring since matriculation:

1. Number of leaves of absence
2. The ratio of completed credits to attempted credits
3. The ratio of unresolved credits to attempted credits
4. The ratio of failed credits to attempted credits

Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to determine the relationship between each Social Welfare variable, level of need, and both Achievement and Retention variables for the total sample as well as for each ethnic group within the sample.

RESULTS

IDENTIFICATION OF SOCIAL WELFARE NEEDS OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN RESPONDENTS

Student Perceptions

Problematic experiences since entering college were reported for all of the five Social Welfare variables. The percentage of the subjects indicating that they had at least some presence of problems in each area are as follows:

	Total Sample	African-Americans
Income Maintenance	72.8%	72.4%
Employment	64.9%	67.9%
Health	59.5%	57.2%
Housing	45.6%	34.5%
Social Services	43.6%	35.7%

Occasional or more frequent problem presence was reported by 48.2%, African-American for Income Maintenance and 42.8% for Employment, Health, Housing, and Social Service problems occurred occasionally or more frequently for 24.1%, 17.2% and 21.4% of these subjects respectively. However, half of the subjects perceived no serious problem for any of the variables. Of those who did perceive the presence of a serious problem, more reported Income Maintenance as the most serious problem (28%) than all other variables combined (21%). These responses regarding the most serious problem were identical to the response rates of the total sample.

Mean Need Scores

Table 1 shows the mean need score for various types of Social Welfare Need for African-American and the total sample.

Table I

Mean Need Scores for Various Types of Social Welfare Need

Type of Social Welfare Need	Mean Need Score All Subjects	African-Americans
Health	11.2	12.2
Housing	12.3	12.6
Employment	10.4	9.6
Social Services	4.1	4.1
Income Maintenance	17.9	17.4
Level of Need	1.1	1.1
Achievement	11.4	9.2
Retention	41.0	38.8

Health

Health since entering college was described as fair or poor by 21% of the African-American subjects compared to 15% of the full sample. School attendance was frequently prevented for 31% of African-Americans and 20% of the total sample. Similarly, during the Spring 1987 semester 30% of African-American students were absent 4 or more days due to this variable compared to 20% of all subjects. Of the African-American students kept in bed by illness or injury in the past years (43%), two-thirds were confined 3 or more days. All African-American students had contact with a medical doctor in the past two years although 17% indicated difficulty getting health care. Forty-one percent however, had no contact with a dentist in the past two years.

Housing

More African-Americans (43.3%) than the full sample (32.5%) rated their homes as a fair or poor place to live while in school, 48.3% of African-Americans as compared to 22.8% of the total sample resided in homes that are overcrowded by federal standards. U.S. Census Bureau measures indicated poor housing conditions for 20-35% of African-American on 4 of 11 items. These four items all concerned poor heating and plumbing conditions. Over one fourth of African-Americans had moved since entering college and 10.3% were homeless at some point. Although 72.4% had their own bedrooms, 31% did not have a quiet place in their homes to study uninterrupted or their own desks. Commuting time from residence to school for most students was 90 minutes or less.

Employment

A full 45% of all the respondents were employed during the Spring 1987 semester. African-Americans were employed at the rate of 48.3%; over one third of those employed worked more than 20 hours per week. Working students were more often dissatisfied with salaries (35.7%) than employment conditions, time of day or number of hours. This variable prevented 61.5% of all employed students and 83.3% of African-Americans from doing school work five or more times during the semester.

Social Services

Of the seven measures of occurrence of this variable only 2 items, death and critical illness in the household, has been experienced by 15% or more of all subjects more than rarely. Fifteen percent or more African-American households experienced death and critical illness as well as loss of job and arrest/legal problems more than rarely. Frequent or very frequent occurrences of loss of job and domestic violence were reported by 9% and 11.3% of the sample respectively as compared to 6.8% and 10.1% of African-Americans.

Income Maintenance

Insufficient money to meet the cost of four of six measures of basic necessities was reported by the total sample: clothing (26.9%), rent (23.4%), medical care (22.2%), and food (16%). African-American students reported insufficient money to meet the cost of these measures as follows: clothing (31%), rent (13.7%), medical care (13.7%), and food (21.4%). The median net taxable income for the group was $7,752. The median for African-Americans was $7,347. Non-taxable income was received by more than 15% of this sub-group from the seven sources presented. Social Security (21%). Aid to Families with Dependent Children was received by African-Americans at the same rate (10%) as the total sample. In-kind resources from Food Stamps were received by 13.8% and 27.6% had Medicaid coverage. Less than 10% of the African-Americans received any other benefits or services including rent subsidy, public housing and day care services.

Financial Aid from State, Federal, and SEEK funds are of major income maintenance importance to the vast majority of the respondents as follows:

	All Subjects	African-Americans
TAP	95.1%	86.2%
PELL	87.8%	86.2%
SEEK	73.4%	64.3%

Family support, summer employment, and employment during the school year were rated as of major importance to meeting educational costs by 52%, 41% and 40% of African-Americans respectively.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NEED AND RETENTION/ACHIEVEMENT

A substantial proportion of the respondents who identified a reason listed a Social Welfare problem as the explanation for why their academic performance since matriculation has not been better. The chart below represents the reason cited as the cause of lowered performance as well as the percentage of students that named each type of problem.

Reason for Performance	Percentage of all Students Who Gave an Explanation	Percentage of African-Americans Who Gave an Explanation
Social Services	18.0	20.8
Employment	11.5	4.2
Health	8.2	8.3
Housing	3.3	4.2
Income Maintenance	1.6	16.7

Table 2 shows the product-moment correlations between the various Social Welfare variables and Retention and Achievement measures.

TABLE 2

Product-Moment Correlations Between Various Types and Level of Social Welfare Need and Measures of Academic Performance (N = 82)

Type of Social Welfare Need	Measures of Academic Performance Retention (r)	Achievement (r)
Health	-.23*	-.22*
Housing	-.21*	-.03
Employment	-.21	-.16
Social Services	-.26**	-.20*
Income Maintenance	-.19	-.14
Level of Need	-.33**	-.25**

*=P .05
**=P .01

The table shows that all types of Social Welfare need as well as the level of need, as herein operationally defined, are negatively related to Retention for the total sample. Social Services correlated more highly with Retention than the other Social Welfare variables. The highest correlation however is between level of need and Retention. According to these data, then, the presence of any type of Social Welfare need decreases Retention at the .05 level of significance. The greatest decrease in Retention results from the summated, standardized score from all Social Welfare scales which is operationally defined as the level of need.

With regard to Achievement for all respondents, the table shows that only two variables, Health and Social Services, are significantly related to decreased Achievement. Again, the summate level of need measure was most highly related to Achievement.

Table 3 illustrates the product-moment correlations between the various types and level Social Welfare Need and Retention and Achievement measures by Ethnic Group. The table shows the role of ethnicity in the variation of effect on the variables under investigation on academic outcome.

TABLE 3

Product-Moment Correlations Between Various Types and Level of Social Welfare Need and Measures of Academic Performance by Ethnicity

	Ethnic Group							
	African American (N=29)		White (N=11)		Asian (N=11)		Puerto Rican (N=7)	
Type of Social Welfare Need	Ret. r	Ach. r	Ret. r	Ach. r	Ret. r	Ach. r	Ret. r	Ach. r
Health	-.22	-.11	.03	.05	-.52*	-.54*	.68*	.55
Housing	-.07	-.02	-.35	-.31	-.19	.32	-.21	-.16
Employment	-.38*	-.40*	-.27	-.40	-.41	.08	-.13	.04
Social Services	-.23	-.05	-.57*	-.52	-.37	.08	.17	.21
Income Maintenance	-.19	-.03	-.47	-.29	-.23	.13	.10	.01
Level of Need	-.35*	-.24	-.48	-.48	-.65*	.58	.12	.17

	Other Hispanic (N=15)	
Type of Social Welfare Need	Ret. r	Ach. r
Health	-.05	-.13
Housing	-.24	-.10
Employment	.05	-.06
Social Services	-.15	-.16
Income Maintenance	-.36	-.42
Level of Need	-.18	-.25

* P = .05

Ret.= Retention

Ach.= Achievement

CONCLUSIONS

Instrument Administration

The administration of the questionnaire required substantial time and effort beyond that required for mail distribution. Although students in this sample were willing to respond to the Investigator when contacted by telephone, few had reacted initially to the survey despite two mailings of the questionnaire. Many students indicated that they had never received the questionnaire although "current" mailing addresses provided by the college were used. Counselors were able to provide phone numbers for all but a few students. Yet, most of the students who did not participate could not be reached by telephone due to disconnected phone numbers. Although the telephone interview as an alternative data collection strategy proved to be fruitful, it was necessary to make multiple calls to many students. The telephone interview approach therefore was time-consuming and resulted in a significant increase in research time beyond that of the original Projected Time Table.

Identification of Social Welfare Needs

African-American students perceived problems in all Social Welfare areas. Although this sub-group's perceptions paralleled the total sample's perception of problems with Income Maintenance, Employment and Health, they indicated fewer problematic experiences with Housing and Social Services than other respondents. Generally, African-American students perceived their non-educational needs in much the same manner as other ethnic groups.

This similarity of perceived needs was collaborated by the normative measures solicited by the research instrument. The Mean Scores for all types of Social Welfare Need were nearly identical for African-American students and other respondents. These findings suggest that there may be more similarities among low-income urban students than differences by ethnicity with regard to identifiable non-educational needs. Thus, many of the following conclusions concerning African-American Social Welfare may be generalizable to disadvantaged, commuter students.

While African-American students in the sample as a whole tended to be healthy, the results indicated that there is need for preventive health care. Short-term health problems often interfered with school attendance--absences due to health approached the limits of the SEEK attendance policy for one third of these students. Dental care appears to be an area of need since many students had not had dental check-ups in the past two years.

Housing conditions for these students appear to be inconducive to educational pursuits as indicated by more frequent overcrowding, heating problems and/or residence changes. Although the majority of students appear to have the physical space for studying, such space was not adequately equipped or sufficiently private for studying at home.

A substantial number of students were employed. Many of those who worked devoted a disproportionate amount of time to employment but still were not satisfied with earnings. Employment accounted for incomplete school work on a regular basis for those African-American subjects who work while attending school, at a higher rate than other students.

The need for social services tended to be generated by household membership rather than students' own personal concerns, thus indirectly affecting students.

Income maintenance appeared to be a major problem area. With a median income of $7,347, basic necessities were not consistently available. Benefits from non-taxable sources were seldom available to supplement low income levels. Few students or their household members had access to resources that would assist in meeting medical, nutritional, shelter or clothing deficits. These findings suggest that the near poverty level status of the students may be a primary factor in Social Welfare needs. Members of working poor families, the subjects exhibit income maintenance need, but may not meet criteria for such services, as their household incomes are somewhat above the eligibility levels required.

Relationship Between Need and Retention/Achievement

The importance of non-academic factors to the academic performance of the African-Americans studied in this research was demonstrated by the number of students who perceived Social Welfare problems as playing a meaningful role in limiting their academic success. This perception of the sample was supported by the consistent negative relationship between all individual Social Welfare variables as well as the composite Level of Need variable and Retention. However, only the Employment variable and Level of Need were significantly related to Retention. Employment significantly decreased Achievement. These findings suggest that Employment issues are important to understanding the persistence and success of African-American students, since not only did the data reveal that both Retention and Achievement were decreased by the presence of Employment Need but that this decrease is significant at the standard Social Welfare research level of less than .05.

Further, the composite impact of Social Welfare variables as measured by Level of Need decreased Retention at the .05 level of significance. This result demonstrates the efficacy of the Ecological Perspective on which the study was based. The overall effect of the variables on Retention was more significant than the effect of individual problem areas. In other words, the total Social Welfare environment with which students interacted had a greater (more significant) impact than its individual aspects.

The non-academic factors studied were less important to student Achievement than Retention. Although all of the variables correlated negatively with Achievement, the Product-Moment Co-efficients for all types of Social Welfare Needs, except Employment, were lower for Achievement than Retention.

As was the case with Retention, Level of Need was uncovered as more significant to Achievement than any individual factor, as would be theorized according to the Ecological Perspective. Still, the correlation with Level of Need was significant for Retention but not Achievement. These data therefore suggest that Social Welfare factors are more important to the ability of African-American students to persist than to their ability to accomplish academically.

Health and Social Services were the predominating individual factors in both decreased Retention and Achievement for the total sample. However, variations in the analysis by ethnic group membership indicates that the understanding of the impact of non-educational concerns is somewhat mediated by ethnicity, especially for African-American students. While White students and Asian students respectively generated Social Service and Health patterns consistent with the sample, the predominant factor for both the Retention and Achievement of Black students was Employment.

The results for the study suggest that Employment and level of Social Welfare need as factors in the retention of African-American students are worthy of concerted attention in serving this population.

FOOTNOTES

1. Astin, Alexander W., Preventing Students from Dropping Out, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

2. Munro, Barbara H., "Dropouts from Higher Education: Path Analysis of a National Sample," American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 18 (1981), pp. 133-141.

3. White, Jim J. and Sedlacek, William E., Non-Cognitive Predictors of Grades and Retention of Specially Admitted Students, College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland, 1981.

4. Tinto, Vincent, "Dropouts from Higher Education: A Theoretical Synthesis of Recent Research," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 45 (1975), pp. 89-125.

5. Germain, Carol, ed. Social Work Practice: People and Environments, An Ecological Perspective, New York: Columbia University Press, 1979.

6. Office of Special Programs, City University of New York, New York, New York.

7. Tinto, op. cit.

THREE

SOLUTIONS

In spite of the fact that there isn't enough money allocated for recruiting and retaining minorities in higher education, and in spite of all the other problems which interfere with this goal, there are a good many programs in operation which are designed to improve matters. Concerned faculty, administrators and professional groups are at work. Foundations are involved, as evidenced by the announcement in September of 1990 that the General Electric Foundation gave $2.1 million to thirty universities to attract more minorities to teaching positions in the physical sciences, engineering and business, and they expect to contribute $20 million for this purpose over the next decade. In the same month the Ford Foundation awarded $1.6 million to nineteen institutions to diversify the cultural and ethnic content of their curricula, in an effort to improve the racial climate in higher education.

Participants in the Hofstra Conference reported on a wide variety of activities, programs and plans for improving the educational status of minorities. Franklin mentioned programs designed to help high school students prepare for college-transitions like the Vestibule Program in Brooklyn, the Pre-College Booster Study Program under the auspices of Elizabeth City State College in North Carolina, and the Summer Learning Camp at Southern University in New Orleans. Ewers stressed the importance of secondary school counselors, and the need for personnel in higher education to work closely with them in recruiting minorities.

Robertson and McTiernan reported on the efforts of the Graduate Management Admission Council, an incorporated body which includes 83 graduate schools of management, to encourage the recruitment of minorities. Adams spoke of a similar effort by the National Academy of Engineering which has constituted a Committee on Minorities in Engineering. And Howard Hill pointed out that Phi Delta Kappa, an international professional education fraternity, has constituted a Task Force to find ways to encourage minorities to enter the field of education.

Ohio State University has published a special "Handbook for Faculty Searches with Special Reference to Affirmative Action," and this was referred to by Pruitt. The Preface states that:

> Affirmative action should not be confused with passive compliance with regulations, tokenism, or good intentions. It is, instead, a proactive concept which implies initiating aggressive, vigorous, and systematic activities to achieve equality and equity for all individuals. There is no single activity more essential to realizing affirmative action goals than the selection of new faculty. Hiring women and minorities, it has been demonstrated, adds cultural richness to an institution and enhances its vitality and reputation by broadening instructional, curricular, and research efforts. A diverse faculty also creates greater pluralism in the student body by attracting women and minorities; while their

> presence as role models and their efforts at mentorship increase the retention and development of students from these groups.

Tokenism, referred to in the previous paragraph, is defined in Nieves-Squires' paper.

> This is the meaning of tokenism: that power withheld from the vast majority of minorities is offered to a few, so that it may appear that any truly qualified minority can gain access to leadership, recognition and rewards; hence that justice based on merit actually prevails. The token minority is encouraged to see herself as different from most other members of her group; as exceptionally talented and deserving, and to separate herself from the wider minority condition. And she is perceived by "ordinary" members of her group as separate also--perhaps even as stronger than themselves."

Lopez and Scalley have some suggestions for increasing the participation of Puerto Ricans in higher education, a group, they say, "who is the second largest Hispanic group in the U.S., and the second poorest and second least educated among all Hispanics." They suggest, for instance, that Mainland Hispanics spend a semester of study in Puerto Rico so that, among other things, they will be taught by appropriate role models. They believe that future teachers of Hispanic children would also benefit from such an experience.

Russell's paper included the following Table, indicating the responses of Black students when asked what they would do, if President of the University of Washington, to deal with the Black students' problems.

Issues	N
Increase Black Professors	35
Sensitivity Training	22
Improved Academic Advising	14
Black Studies	13
Black Career Days/Job Programs	13
Strengthen Black Peer Unity	10
Increased Financial Aid	8
Integrate Greek Council	7
Publicize Instructional Center Tutorials	7
New Instructor Development	6
Strengthen EOP* Admissions/Financial Aid	6
Publicize Black Studies in Black Community	6
Abolish or Revamp the Daily Newspaper	2
Research on Black Studies	1

*EOP - Education Opportunity Program

Whittaker referred to a Native Indian Teacher Education Program at the University of British Columbia, a program to increase the number of native American teacher of children. This program is one of a number of programs and courses entitled First Nations Studies, which are described in a special catalogue of that title.

Amiotte and Allen spoke of Oglala Lakota College in South Dakota, one of only two accredited four-year colleges on Indian reservations. This institution is "a new animal, a 4-year community college..." It was started by the people of the Pine Ridge Reservation and is chartered by the Oglala Sioux Tribe, and they say, it is run by the community for the community. The authors write, "Our greatest moment at OLC is at graduation when we see students from twenty to sixty years old get their degrees, when we hear how OLC has helped develop their minds and change their lives, when we shake hands with Elaine Kille in Sight, who lived in a 10' x 40' trailer with no electricity or water, had six children and walked or hitchhiked seven miles each way to class but achieved her Bachelor's degree."

Becoming aware of the inadequate number of minorities in institutions of higher learning is the first step in arriving at solutions to the problems of recruitment and retention; examining the reasons for their poor representation is the second; planning and implementing programs is the third.

THE PAPERS

There are three papers in this section, all considerably shortened by the editor for reasons of space. Baker begins her paper, as did many of the participants, by presenting background information about the state of minority education. Then she presents an administrative model which predominately White institutions might use to improve the academic achievement of minority students.

A long-term relationship between St. Lawrence University and the St. Regis Mohawks is the topic of the paper by Wells and White. Edwards and Edwards describe a successful program to prepare Native American social workers at the University of Utah, and in this paper we encounter some familiar themes--the importance of financial assistance; the need for personal support, and, unfortunately, the cutting of the budget. That program, however, continues.

A COMPREHENSIVE MODEL TO ENHANCE THE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF BLACK MINORITY STUDENTS ATTENDING PREDOMINANTLY WHITE COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES

LaVerne L. Baker

University of Southwestern Louisiana

Concern about the decrease in the number of Black students attending colleges and universities in the 1980's is clear from the increasing number of educational conferences, reports, research studies, and articles which have recently focused attention on the problem (Cole, 1987; Collison, 1987; Jaschik, 1987; Marshall, 1987; O'Brien, 1987; Oliver and Etcheverry, 1987). Jaschik (1987) reported on a recent conference in which 120 higher education officials met to discuss the changes needed to attract minority students. The participants concluded that radical changes in their structure, hiring practices, values, and the way they treat students were needed to attract more minority students and professors to their institutions (Jaschik, 1987).

Educators and professionals have also expressed concern about the decreasing number of minority students in graduate professional education programs. Cole (1987) described the crisis as the "minority brain drain" in the discipline of human communication and disorders. Recent reports from the American Council on Education and the National Research Council have caused educators to focus their attention on the lack of future Black teachers and college and university professors because of the decline in the number of Black students, (O'Brien, 1987; "Current lack," 1988). The large number of Black males who do not go to college was a concern addressed by Collison (1987) who reported that Black males are choosing to enlist in the military, attend vocational and technical schools, or take jobs, and are scared away by the rising cost of higher education and an uncertain economic climate.

Marshall (1987) suggested the frightening possibility that Black America will be less educated in the future unless something is done about the problem. The impact of that "frightening possibility" is reinforced by Dr. Robert Atwell, President of the American Council of Education, who indicated that half of the 25 million new jobs available before the year 2000 will require some postsecondary education and by the year 2000, one third of the nation's population will be minority ("Higher education needs," 1988). The possibility that a large segment of our future population will be under-educated and unemployable places a major responsibility on us to seek viable solutions to the problems causing the decline in the number of minorities in higher education.

A review of the current literature reveals many causes for the decline in minority students in higher education. Oliver and Etcheverry (1987, p. 152) state that some of the more prominent reasons given for the drop in applications and acceptance of Blacks by colleges are:

> rapidly expanding tuition costs, a shift in student financial assistance from grants to low-interest loans, an increase in the number of minority households below the poverty level, a de-emphasis on affirmative action as a mechanism for ensuring

> equal employment opportunities, continued differential between Black and White high school students' academic preparation and performance, comparatively low Black college entrance examination scores, and a shift in the national mood concerning the importance and means of promoting social equality.

The literature reveals other factors that influence the decision of minority students to remain in school, especially in predominantly white institutions. The increase in incidents of racism, from subtle to openly hostile, in predominantly white schools, is cited as a reason for the decline in the enrollment of Black students (Louis, 1986; 1987; Marshall, 1987). Fleming (1984, p. 55) states that "from the evidence provided by Black students themselves, the problem is one of institutional abandonment, isolation, and bias in the classroom--factors that create a hostile interpersonal climate." Claerbout (1978) studied the alienation of Black students in small, private liberal arts colleges and produced evidence which indicated that Black students experience alienation in small colleges (as well as in large universities) where minority students are often so few in number that they do not have adequate peer group support to cope with the additional problems they face as minority students (Louis, 1986; 1987; Malveaux, 1979; Southgate, 1987).

The inadequate number of Black faculty and administrators to serve as role models and mentors contributes to the lack of support experienced by Black students (Blackwell, 1983). Blackwell (1983, p. 115) studied networks and mentors for Black graduate and professional school students and reported that "irrespective of institutional type, that is, public or private, Black students encounter greater difficulty then do white students in obtaining a mentor."

During the past two decades, many programs have been created and implemented to recruit, retain, and meet the needs of Black students. There is financial aid, remedial assistance, academic and career counseling, Black studies, minority affairs services, and the hiring of Black administrators and faculty. Peer groups, role models, and mentors have also been used in various ways to assist minority students. Although many of these support programs have been helpful, there is a need for a systematic way of integrating the various programs and resources so that Black students will receive maximum benefits.

Academic and interpersonal services are traditional support systems used in institutions of higher learning to assist students--these support systems vary depending on the resources, goals, and purpose of the institution. The literature reveals that Black students attending predominantly White schools are not receiving the maximum benefits from the academic and interpersonal support systems provided (Blackwell, 1983; Fleming, 1984).

The purpose of this paper is to present a comprehensive model for integrating the support services provided by predominantly White colleges and universities, so that Black students attending these institutions can receive their maximum benefits and thus enhance their academic achievement.

Components of the Comprehensive Model

The comprehensive model includes two interdependent support systems, the Academic Support System and the Interpersonal Support System, which are commonly utilized in colleges and universities to assist students from matriculation to graduation from the institution (See Figure 1). Each system of support is composed of three major categories. Those in the Academic Support System are Financial Support, Program Support, and University, College and Department Support. Peer Groups, Role Models, and Mentors are the three major categories for the Interpersonal Support System. Each of the six major categories is composed of two minor components as shown in Figure 1. (See page 76).

Program Coordinator

The program coordinator serves as the Chief Administrator of minority concerns and facilitates the implementation of the academic and interpersonal support systems. The coordinator identifies institutional racist policies damaging to minority students and faculty, assists in the development of policies and procedures for dealing with overt racist incidents and complaints of covert racist behaviors, provides opportunities for discussion and dialogue between Black and White students and faculty, and promotes interracial and cultural interaction between Black and White racial groups.

Minority Students

> According to Shaefer (1979, p. 4) a minority is defined not by being outnumbered but by having five characteristics: unequal treatment, distinguishing physical or cultural traits, involuntary membership, in-group marriage, and awareness of subordination. Minority groups are classified in terms of race, ethnicity or nationality, religion, and sex.

The comprehensive model presented here focuses on the Afro-American minority group.

ACADEMIC SUPPORT SYSTEM

The Academic Support System is concerned with all of the programs and resources which are provided by the university/college to assist students in pursuit of a higher education.

Financial Support

Financial Support requires an organized program committed to providing adequate financial assistance for minority students. Personnel in the financial support network should be aggressive and knowledgeable about Federal, State, and University funding sources as well as scholarships and funds available for minority students from foundations, corporations, civic clubs, local, state, and national organizations and special interest groups. The program should include procedures for informing Black students and their copy Figure 1. Comprehensive Model of Academic and Interpersonal Support Systems.

parents about funding resources and how to apply for them while the students are in high school.

Program Support

Program Support should provide services which assist students in the adjustment to college, develop their academic potential, and guide them in meeting the requirements necessary for graduation. Services such as academic and career counseling, remedial programs (writing, reading, and math), study skills (note-taking, time management, exam preparation), and tutoring are some of the major services included.

Minority Affairs is a special program designed to meet the needs of minority individuals in the college and university community. The strengths and cultural diversity that minority students and faculty contribute to the campus environment should be emphasized. Major responsibilities of the Minority Affairs component are monitoring the hiring of minority administrators, faculty, and staff, assisting with the recruitment and retention of minority students, working with Student Affairs in relation to specific needs of minority students, monitoring incidents of overt and covert racism and discrimination, and serving as a clearinghouse for information about minority members of the college or university community.

University, College, Department Support

The University, College, Department Support category focuses on the commitment of the university to provide all students an equal chance to develop their maximum academic potential. College and university presidents must provide the leadership for specific changes, such as initiating and supporting programs and policies which provide equal opportunities for minorities and working to bring about an awareness of procedures, customs, and traditions which have historically been detrimental to minority students. College and university deans and department heads must accept the responsibility for implementing the necessary changes in their respective areas and disciplines.

The Faculty and Advising Support component focuses on the importance of faculty in relation to minority students. Faculty members in predominantly white institutions need assistance in examining their attitudes and beliefs about the educational abilities of Black students to determine whether, covertly or overtly, they are prejudiced against these students.

Intradepartment Professional Development Support is concerned with the education of Black students in the departmental academic disciplines. The department head has the responsibility for establishing a climate in which minority students experience acceptance by faculty members and their white peers. The head of the department should monitor Black student access to mentors, fellowships, internships, and scholarships to enhance their professional growth. The department head should monitor minority student participation in classes, assigned study groups, student and department interest groups, and make a conscientious effort to hire minority faculty members in the discipline.

INTERPERSONAL SUPPORT SYSTEM

The Interpersonal Support System provides the human support network which influences the psychosocial adjustment of the student and determines the quality of curricular and extracurricular campus life.

Peer Groups

With adequate peer group support, Black students may feel outside the mainstream of campus life and experience feelings of loneliness, isolation, and alienation which inhibit academic achievement and psychosocial development. Minority-student-peer-groups which are initiated, organized, and governed by minority students play a major role in providing Black students with opportunities to develop supportive relationships, coping strategies, and leadership skills. A wide variety of Black student groups such as Black student organizations, professional and interest groups, peer tutoring and peer counseling, intramural sports, and living accommodations should be available. Black Heritage and Afro-American Cultural experiences to help Black students maintain cultural identity and self-esteem should be supported when initiated by minority student peer groups.

Majority Student Peer Groups are student groups which have been traditionally organized for and dominated by White students, and they can play a major role in helping to create a campus environment which allows participation by all students. Often White students are not consciously aware that Black students are being left out of the mainstream of campus life. Majority students may volunteer to be Peer Pals and help Black students move into the mainstream of campus activities, especially prestigious and policy-making organizations such as honor societies and student government. The institution must convey the message that all students have equal access to the educational and social benefits of campus life.

Role Models

Historically, successful Black role models in business and the professions have been limited for Black youth because of the racial isolation, exclusionary policies of higher education, and economic deprivation experienced by Black Americans (Blackwell, 1981). A recurring theme in the literature regarding the recruitment and retention of Black students in higher education has been the need for the employment of more minorities who can serve as role models and mentors in predominantly white institutions (Blackwell, 1981; Collison, 1987; Oliver and Etcheverry, 1987).

The Role Model category in the Interpersonal Support System focuses on the need for minority faculty in the academic disciplines at the local, state, and national levels. Minority students need to see individuals from the same racial group employed as administrators, faculty and staff. Opportunities need to be provided for minority students to become acquainted with minority faculty through casual and informal gatherings. Students should be introduced to minority role models at district, state, and national conferences. Minority faculty and professionals can be invited to come to the university as guest speakers, consultants, or lecturers. A wide variety of experiences can be provided for minority students to experience minority role models once this commitment is made.

Mentors

The two types of mentors are faculty mentors in academic disciplines and mentors at local and state levels. Cooper (1985, p. 115) provides a descriptive definition of mentor.

> a mentor is anyone who functions in an advisor/guiding role as protector, benefactor, sponsor, champion, advocate, supporter, or counselor. A mentor takes a personal interest in the career of another, personally guiding that individual's progress while pointing out pitfalls to be avoided and shortcuts to be pursued, and providing valuable insights and knowledge to the protege.

Minority students are in great need of mentors because many of them are first generation higher education students and have little knowledge about career goals and few paths for advancement in a career or profession. The knowledge that one individual is concerned and supportive has made the difference for many Black students who have struggled to achieve in an unfriendly educational setting. Ideally, all students need mentoring, but most departments do not have an adequate number of faculty members to meet the mentoring needs of the students. Cooper (1985, p. 115) reports that "mentors tend to choose proteges with whom they can identify or who are socially similar to themselves. Thus, Blacks are not likely to have mentor/sponsors unless more Blacks, qualified to do so, are able and willing to assume the role." The gap betwen supply and demand for mentors can be decreased by utilizing mentors in the local community and in the state. Potential Black mentors need to be identified and asked to serve as mentors for minority students. The mentoring component of the model is one of the weakest areas of support for minority students.

A comprehensive model to enhance the academic achievement of minority students has been discussed. Although the focus of this paper has been the Black student, the comprehensive model can be applied to other minority groups including women. The model is based on academic and interpersonal support systems which are traditionally provided for students enrolled in colleges or universities. Innovative and dynamic new programs can be integrated into the various categories and components because of the flexibility of the model. It is hoped that the comprehensive model will be used as a constructive instrument to assist administrators in their efforts to provide a supportive learning environment which allows all minority students to achieve their maximum academic potential.

REFERENCES

Blackwell, J.E. (1981). Mainstreaming Outsiders. New York: General Hall, Inc.

Blackwell, J.E. (1983). Networking and mentoring: A study of cross-generational experiences of blacks in graduate and professional schools. Georgia: Southern Education Foundation.

Claerbaut, D.P. (1987). Black student alienation: A study. California: Reed and Eterovich.

Cole, L. (1987). Minority brain drain in human communication sciences and disorders. Office of Minority Concerns, American Speech, Language, and Hearing Association, Rockville, Maryland.

Collison, M., N-K (1987). More young black men choosing not to go to college. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 24, pp. A1, A26, A27.

Cooper, C.C. (1985). Mentors can serve black youth in many ways. Journal of Negro Education, 54, 115-116.

Current lack of minority doctoral candidates leads to future minority faculty shortage (1988, March). Black Issues in Higher education, 4 (23), pp. 1, 8.

Fleming, J. (1984). Blacks in College. California: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Higher education needs to regain momentum on efforts to increase minority participation, Atwell tells ACE meeting. (1988, February). Black Issues in Higher Education, 4 (21) p. 19.

Jaschik, S. (1987). Major changes seen needed for colleges to attract minorities. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 24 (13), pp. A1, A31.

Louis, E.T. (1986, August). Black and blue on campus. Essence, pp. 67, 132, 134, 138.

Louis, E.T. (1987, August). Racism on campus. Ebony, pp. 53, 120, 122.

Malveaux, J. (1979, August). Black women on white campuses. Essence, pp. 78-79, 102, 105, 106, 109, 130.

Marshall, M. (1987, September). The alarming decline in the number of black college students. Ebony, pp. 44, 46, 49.

O'Brien, E.M. (1987, November). ACE Report predicts further decline in minority teachers. Black Issues in Higher Education, 4 (16), 1.

Oliver, J. and Etcheverry, N. (1987). Factors influencing the decisions of academically talented black students to attend college. Journal of Negro Education, 56, 152, 161.

Southgate, M. (1987, August). Between two worlds. Essence, pp. 54, 116, 118, 120.

Shaefer, R.T. (1979). Racial and ethnic groups. Boston: Little Brown and Co.

TRIBAL COOPERATION IN EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR NATIVE AMERICANS: TWENTY YEARS OF ST. REGIS MOHAWK-ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY ASSOCIATION

Robert N. Wells, Jr.
Denise White

St. Lawrence University

The St. Regis (Akwesasne) Mohawks and St. Lawrence University have been working together on a wide range of educational efforts for almost two decades. In its relationship with the Mohawks, St. Lawrence has been fortunate to have had a dedicated core of Mohawk leaders to work with who have strong commitment to education and community revitalization.

Since 1969 St. Lawrence students have been tutoring Mohawks on the reservation in a wide range of subjects at high school and junior high school level. Tutoring is one or two evenings a week on the reservation, which is forty miles from the university. A key goal of tutoring is to assist Mohawk youths in passing the New York State Regents exam. Until very recently St. Lawrence tutors assisted Mohawk adults in high school equivalency (GED) exam preparation, but Federal cutbacks in funding reduced the Mohawk Adult Education Program staff which scheduled tutoring sessions and identified Mohawk students. The tutoring program is voluntary and fully funded by the student activities fund on campus.

In the early seventies the two communities embarked upon a number of educational projects--the first was the Mohawk Library project. The nearest libraries were fifteen miles away and no public transportation was available. Working together, the Mohawks and St. Lawrence students raised $25,000 and the Mohawks, who are skilled construction workers, built the first Indian community library. A grant of $5,000 by the Donner Foundation to St. Lawrence and the Mohawks provided the basis for the core collection. Shortly after the opening of the library, General Motors donated a bookmobile van which regularly visits all geographical areas of the reservation in Canada and the United States. The Akwesasne Cultural Museum opened on the ground floor of the library building. The cultural center is both a museum of Mohawk cultural artifacts and a center of contemporary Mohawk art, cultural education and historical investigation. Last spring a new Mohawk library and cultural center opened on the reservation, staffed by Mohawk librarians and cultural specialists.

A second project which grew out of the tutoring experience was the Upward Bound Program at St. Lawrence. More than five hundred Mohawks, and a like number of North Country students, have participated in the six-week summer on campus over a seventeen-year period. Beyond basic skills, academic enrichment and college preparation, the program stresses Mohawk language, culture, history and Indian identity. The college acceptance and matriculation rates for Upward Bound students have been excellent and many of the early graduates of the program are in leadership positions in the tribe, schools and business.

The first institute on "The American Indian Student in Higher Education" was held on the St. Lawrence University campus in July, 1971. For the next fifteen years over six hundred college educators, administrators, tribal leaders and government officials participated in the largest ongoing educational workshop on Indian Education. The purpose of the institute was to enhance cooperation between colleges and tribal communities in serving Indian students, to improve what was a shocking college attendance and retention rate of Indian students.

Perhaps the most lasting aspect of these fifteen workshops held on the St. Lawrence campus was the network which developed between the college and the Indian community and the sensitivity which developed between the two communities regarding their need to work together to improve the college experience for Native Americans. On a more concrete level, the workshop recommendations of the first two institutes had a decided impact on the New York State Regents' Position Paper on "Native American Education," the first of its kind in the country.

Close on the heels of the Upward Bound Program and the Mohawk Library and Cultural Center project there followed three important programs. In 1973 the Office of Education asked St. Lawrence University to work with tribal communities across New York State to develop a Special Services Program to provide financial aid, counseling and support services for Native Americans in postsecondary schools. The new program, Native American Special Services (NASS) operated on twenty-five campuses across New York State and served over 350 Indian students. In conjunction with NASS, St. Lawrence sponsored a summer academic bridge program for pre-freshmen Native Americans who would be attending two and four year schools in New York. This program, funded by International Nickel and IBM, provided college skills courses and orientation for over 100 students over a four-year period. The regional NASS counselors were important advocates for Indian students on the 25 campuses and they provided an important link between the tribal communities and the students while at school. NASS functioned for eleven years until funding restrictions and regulation changes forced the decentralization of the program to specific campus settings. Like its predecessor, the Institute, NASS established a key network between the Native American community, colleges and the New York State Education Department.

Concurrent with the founding of NASS, St. Lawrence and the Mohawk Community developed a model teacher-training program for educators in Indian schools. Called the St. Regis Mohawk-St. Lawrence Native American Teacher Training Program, this demonstration project was funded for three years by the U.S. Office of Education under Title IV (now Title XI) of the Indian Education Act. During the period of the project over one hundred fifty teachers in the Salmon River and Massena, New York, and Cornwall, Ontario, school districts participated in an extensive in-service program to sensitize them to the educational needs of Native Americans in their schools. Credit earned by Mohawks during participation in this program was applied toward degree programs and teacher and teacher-aide certification. This teacher training program was instrumental in changing the educational climate in the contracting schools serving Indian students and in increasing the number of Indian professionals and para-professionals on the staffs.

The third program was initiated by tribal education leaders with Mater Dei, a small two-year Catholic college in Ogdensburg, New York, 40 miles from the Mohawk Reservation. Since its founding in the early 1960s Mater Dei had developed a strong commitment to serve local educational needs, particularly disadvantaged rural people. Mater Dei began offering classes on the reservation during the afternoon and evening hours. The tuition price was affordable and the curriculum was oriented toward meeting educational needs of Mohawk adults working in the tribal and school program. At the time the Mohawk Tribe employed over 350 people and it was able to defray tuition expenses through federal grants. In addition, most Mohawk students qualified for New York State Indian tuition aid or HEOP aid (New York Higher Education Opportunity Program for disadvantaged students). Thus began higher education classes on the reservation which are now in their sixteenth year. Shortly afterward, North Country Community College in Saranac Lake, New York, began offering additional classes on the Mohawk Reserve. By 1974 adult Mohawks, some without high school degrees, were receiving their Associate of Arts degrees from Mater Dei without leaving the reservation.

It was this Mater Dei initiative and warm reception by Mohawk adults which led to the development of the St. Regis Mohawk Higher Adult Education Project in 1976. This program was funded for seven of the first eight years by the Office of Education, Title IV. More specifically the program was designed to develop Native American teachers, particularly within the adult Indian community. The tribe approached St. Lawrence and we agreed to begin the program despite an initial tentativeness which stemmed from a general unfamiliarity with adult continuing education. St. Lawrence is primarily a selective private liberal arts college for 2100 young adults and its program is 95 percent liberal arts--residential. Other than our Education Department, we had little or no experience in extension teaching, adult education and Native American curriculum.

With the encouragement of Minerva White, the NASS Director, and the leadership of Denise White, the first Director of the Mohawk Adult Higher Education Project, we developed a curriculum program to meet the project's objectives, and began teaching undergraduate and graduate courses in the Fall of 1976.

Most students entered with two years credit derived from the Mater Dei program. When federal funding terminated in 1984 the university undertook primary responsibility for the program funding. All courses in the undergraduate program are taught on the reservation at times convenient to the students. All graduate courses, with the exception of an educational practicum, are also taught on site. Since its inception in 1976, 15 adults have earned B.A. degrees and 10 are presently matriculated. Twenty-five students have received the Master of Education degree and 11 have earned teaching certificates. Over thirty-five St. Lawrence faculty have taught on the reservation. Many Mohawk graduates now hold responsible positions in the tribal government, schools, surrounding universities, government agencies and private firms. Two of the current three Mohawk Chiefs are graduates of St. Lawrence.

More than any program undertaken with the Mohawks, the adult higher education program on the reservation has been responsible for institutional change on the St. Lawrence campus. Administrators and faculty have been intimately involved with the program and this has created a broader base of support for our Native American programs in general, and a greater awareness of the need to honor our ongoing commitment with concrete deeds. A very positive offshoot of the program on the reservation has been the development of Native American courses and curriculum materials to enrich our on-campus offerings for undergraduate students. Currently we are carefully reviewing a proposal for an interdepartmental minor in Native American Studies.

Beginning with the on-reservation tutoring program, St. Lawrence undertook the recruitment of Native American students. Since 1969 over one hundred Native Americans have graduated from the university. Presently there are 15 undergraduates on campus. By comparison there are 25 Mohawk adults in the reservation program. The university's policy is to fund American Indian student needs with scholarships and work study grants and to minimize loans. Since 1969 St. Lawrence has raised over $200,000 in private funds for Native American scholarships. Grant proposals to support the programs described in this paper total over 2.5 million dollars. There is an active Native American Student Organization on campus and the group sponsors a Native American cultural awareness day each semester.

St. Lawrence's relationship with the Mohawks continues to evolve in a range of activities. The Environmental Studies Program has been very involved with the Mohawks in the field of toxic wastes. The Canadian Studies Program offers courses in Canadian-American Indian Law and Politics and Canadian Native Peoples. Four years ago a major conference was sponsored by the Canadian Studies Program and the Government Department on Canada-United States Native Issues. The St. Lawrence North Country Research Center is providing grants for research on Mohawk local history. The Education Department has provided key support to the Mohawk Teacher Training Program, the Mohawk Adult Higher Education Project and Upward Bound and its staff. The University Development Office has been of great assistance in securing funds to support the various Native American programs.

As a new generation of Mohawk and university leadership emerges it, would be appropriate to assess our ongoing relationship. New priorities face the Mohawk community as it strives for greater self-determination. Throughout the country Indian college enrollment is declining and colleges like St. Lawrence need to devise means whereby they can continue to serve on- and off-campus. Poverty, unemployment, alcoholism, and a deteriorating social environment plague most Indian communities. For most Indian communities, rural or urban, education is the principal means to alleviate the underdevelopment which characterizes Indian country. New approaches to enhance educational opportunity in and beyond the reservation must be developed and higher education has a key role to play. So also will the generation of Native Americans who grew up in the 60s and 70s and now assume positions of responsibility in the Indian world. It is to this generation that we look for continued partnership and leadership.

The authors would like to acknowledge that the description of the evolution of the St. Lawrence-Mohawk education cooperation over the past two decades are their own and do not necessarily represent the views of the Mohawk Tribe. Tribal members familiar with the relationship have commented on the paper and we are indebted for their suggestions, comments and revisions.

AN EFFECTIVE AMERICAN INDIAN SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM: RECRUITMENT, RETENTION AND GRADUATION

E. Daniel Edwards
Margie Egbert-Edwards

University of Utah

INTRODUCTION

The University of Utah's Graduate School of Social Work reaffirmed its commitment to educating American Indians for social work careers in the late 1960's when considerable discussion and planning resulted in the application for, and eventual award of, a National Institute of Mental Health grant in 1970 for the recruitment and training of American Indians for social work careers. The original grant was funded for a five-year period, and initial project efforts were devoted to recruitment activities. The first students to enroll at the Graduate School of Social Work through this program were admitted in fall 1972 and graduated in June 1974. Since 1974, 112 American Indians have graduated with their M.S.W. degrees and five American Indians have attained their D.S.W. degrees.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Of the 112 American Indian M.S.W. graduates, 73 (65%) are female and 39 (35%) are male. More than 40 tribal groups are represented by the graduates, with approximately 40% being members of the Navajo tribe. Other tribes, represented by several students, include the Sioux, Ute, Paiute, Shoshone and Crow. Over half of the graduates are fluent in their native languages, with their Indian language being their first language. Approximately 95% of the graduates are currently working in assignments with major responsibilities directed toward work with American Indian people. Two graduates are continuing in doctoral studies. All of the D.S.W. graduates have been or are currently employed at universities in graduate schools of social work, and 12 of the M.S.N. graduates have been or are currently working in university settings. Approximately three-fourths of the graduates are working on reservations or Indian lands. Many graduates have assumed or are currently assuming positions of leadership in federal, state, tribal, public and private organizations. The fact that these graduates continue their social work professional involvement, and maintain employment assignments with American Indian people reflects positively upon the goals and objectives of the project and provides evidence of the personal satisfaction of the graduates with their career choices.

A number of surveys and research studies have been conducted with the American Indian graduates and social work faculty since this program began in 1970. The results of these studies will be discussed below along with recommendations for establishment of recruitment and education programs for minority students of color.

COMMITMENT TO THE AMERICAN INDIAN TRAINING PROGRAM

The most important variable that has contributed to the success of the American Indian Social Work Career Training Program has been the commitment of the graduate school administration, its faculty and the general University of Utah administration. The original grant was written by two non-Indian faculty who had experience working with Southwestern American Indian social service programs. The grant and its goals were endorsed by the entire faculty, with the understanding that the program would require a long-term commitment to the American Indian graduate students whose primary language and cultural ties were to their own tribal groups. Faculty committed themselves to extensive study and on-going meetings to expand their understanding of American Indian culture. This effort further enhanced the incorporation of content from American Indian and other minority groups into the entire curriculum.

The American Indian project staff consulted regularly with the faculty both individually and in appropriate meetings to facilitate the adjustment and education of the Indian students. Over the past 19 years the project staff have oriented four new deans and many new faculty to the goals and objectives of this program. Without exception, support has been ongoing, and the project has been a source of pride for all faculty who have contributed to its success. This commitment was reaffirmed three years ago when the faculty endorsed the American Indian project as the number one program priority of the Graduate School of Social Work.

The University of Utah's general administration has also been supportive of the project. For the past three years, with the withdrawal of many federal funds, the University of Utah has provided additional stipend monies and tuition waivers for many American Indian students. The University administration has also sought to have the program approved as an ongoing program, funded directly through the Utah State Legislature as a line item of the University of Utah's budget.

THE RECRUITMENT COMPONENT OF THE PROGRAM

Initial Efforts

The first goal of the American Indian Social Work Career Training Program was that of recruitment. Eighteen months were devoted to this effort and students were recruited from undergraduate schools of social work, related social sciences and liberal arts programs throughout the State of Utah and at other universities within the Intermountain West. Cooperative relationships were established with undergraduate schools of social work throughout the area. Workshops were held with interested students at four Utah universities on a monthly basis.

A work-study program was established with the cooperation of N.I.M.H., several state and private organizations, and a number of American Indian organizations including the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian Health Service. As many as 40 American Indian undergraduate students were employed in social service agencies for summer work experiences each year. American Indian project staff visited each of these agencies and held regional and total group workshops to support student training experiences. Summer work/study students who showed promise for a social work career were encouraged to apply for admission to the Graduate School.

Many students were recruited from bachelor level positions with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian Health Services, state social service programs and other social work and health related employment positions. One of the interesting developments of the program was that as employees saw younger Native American college students being prepared for M.S.W. programs, the older workers became interested in graduate studies.

The mix of younger and more mature Indian students has been an asset to our entire graduate school program. The older students have considerable employment experience and are willing to share their knowledge and background with all graduate students--adding a positive dimension to out academic study of minority issues, policies and programs.

Current Efforts

Present recruitment efforts are much less extensive. Funding for the summer work-study program is no longer available. Recruitment, however, is facilitated because of earlier efforts and because the current project director has been with the program since its inception in 1970. His contacts throughout the country are extensive. The success of the program also serves as an excellent recruitment factor. Both the reputation of the program and its staff are positive recruitment variables. Perhaps the most satisfying recruitment effort is demonstrated by our former graduates. The vast majority of our current students know and have been positively influenced by one or more of our former graduates.

Strategies

Personal contacts from project staff continue to be important recruitment tools. Recruitment visits to undergraduate schools of social work and nearby reservations are also fruitful in encouraging applications from potential American Indian graduate students.

Research/Survey Responses of Graduates and Faculty

American Indian graduates have indicated that the personal attention they received from the American Indian project staff was instrumental in their applying for graduate studies. The availability of financial assistance was essential to their application. Support from other social work faculty, former graduates, personal friends and family also contributed to their willingness to apply for graduate school.

RETENTION/GRADUATION OF AMERICAN INDIAN STUDENTS

Initial Efforts

Initially, the grant and the School of Social Work budget provided for three staff people to direct the efforts of this program. The director was one of the original writers of the grant and was assigned to the project on a part-time basis. Two other staff members fulfilled their responsibilities on a full-time basis with some classroom teaching assignments.

Current Efforts

Currently, the director and staff person serve the project on a part-time basis. The director of the program is one of the original staff members--an American Indian who also serves as Director of the University of Utah's Native American Ethnic Studies Program. The second staff member works three-fourths time and is responsible for student counseling and research currently conducted under the N.I.M.H. grant.

Strategies

The most essential component of the American Indian Social Work Career Training Program, from the viewpoint of the students, has been financial assistance. Without this assistance, graduates indicate that they would not have been able to complete the M.S.W. degree. Many of the graduate students are single parents. Some of the married students have had as many as six children.

The majority of the students are bilingual. They have reported that being able to devote their attention to graduate school on a full-time basis has contributed greatly to their success. Their greatest fears have often been related to the use of the English language in both written and oral work. Because they have been able to devote full time to academics and were not encumbered by employment obligations, they have reported substantial improvement in their oral and written skills.

Financial assistance has been provided through the National Institute of Mental Health, the University of Utah, the American Indian Tribal Scholarship Program, American Indian Tribal scholarship funds, and some state and federal aid programs.

The second most important component of the program has been the commitment and contributions of the staff. Over the years, three non-Indian and six American Indian professors have worked as members of the American Indian project staff. They have provided a number of services and programs for the students' benefit including those described below:

- Weekly study groups for the first year students to assist them with their orientation and achievement at the school as well as provide opportunities for socialization and comradeship.

- Study groups organized by the students on their own initiative with American Indian and non-Indian students.

- Laboratories, for credit, to meet specific student needs. Communication labs and research labs have been popular with the students. Content in these labs originates from the regular curriculum and is adapted to meet the needs of Indian students and prepare them for career roles within their own tribal groups.

- Individual counseling related to academics, personal problems, family concerns or cultural expectations and conflicts.

- Finding housing and helping students find existing community and university resources for themselves and their family members.

- Social activities organized on an on-going basis. Luncheons are held regularly at the school. Family outings are planned at the school and in staff members' homes for both American Indian students and all minority students and their families. Second year American Indian students have been encouraged to plan a "welcome social" for the first year students. Since the first and second year students are not on campus on the same days, these social activities allow for interaction between the two groups.

- Students participate within the School as student representatives on undergraduate school committees and as student body officers. These activities encourage American Indian students to establish ties to the general social work program.

- Faculty encourage Indian students to relate their classroom assignments to the values, culture, needs and social service programs of American Indians.

IMPORTANCE OF MODELING FOR AMERICAN INDIAN GRADUATE STUDENTS

Faculty support and expectations that the American Indian students will succeed have greatly contributed to the success of this program. It has also been essential that the project staff appropriately model professional expectations for the students. Modeling is a valued component of American Indian culture. Native American adults, and particularly the "elders", are expected to model the important roles, customs and beliefs of their tribes. Because of their age and varied experiences, Indian elders' status is equated with wisdom, and they receive respect and admiration. Those graduate students who are older and more experienced in social work practice and traditional Indian roles, have been sought out as consultants when important issues have arisen. Staff, too, have routinely played consultant roles for the graduate students.

It has been imperative that the people who work most closely with the American Indian students model expectations for performance at the graduate level and for professional social work practice. American Indian project staff have found it important to be dependable and responsible, and have time and a willing attitude when working with American Indian students. These can be exemplified when working with the students by:

1. Addressing personal issues, concerns, and problems in a forthright and up-front manner.

2. Addressing financial concerns and needs immediately.

3. Posting and maintaining an office schedule with a high level of dependability.

4. Being punctual in meeting all assignments with classes, committees and students.

5. Demonstrating an active commitment to the Graduate School of Social Work, the American Indian program and students.

6. Making time and demonstrating a willingness to talk, relax, and promote an attitude and atmosphere in which students will feel comfortable and welcome.

7. Utilizing a personal/professional interaction approach which demonstrates availability and encourages students to discuss personal problems as well as individual strengths, thus encouraging active problem solving and utilization of students' personal strengths to promote education and attainment of personal goals.

8. Addressing quickly and appropriately problematic situations within the school and university which may require modification of the system.

The project staff must also demonstrate a positive and realistic attitude which emanates hope and promise. Students are often anxious and concerned about their potential and ability to achieve in the graduate setting. Staff should:

1. Demonstrate an attitude of hopefulness and confidence in students and their abilities to survive and succeed in an educational setting.

2. Convey confidence in students' abilities to handle personal crises, school expectations and routine daily scheduling.

3. Help students attain a realistic understanding of expectations in the academic setting.

4. Help students face educational expectations one at a time in a logical, sequential order.

5. Assist students to effectively deal with regular and unexpected pressures in academic settings.

6. Share one's own experiences when helpful to students.

7. Encourage students to regard this educational experience as a beginning, while helping them develop an attitude which values continual education and academic involvement throughout their lives.

It is important for American Indian faculty to have an awareness of their own identification with "Indianness", as well as continually strive to develop further understanding of American Indian values, culture and current situations. Non-Indian staff should also strive to develop understanding and respect for American Indian culture and an openness to learn more about Indian values, issues and strengths. American Indian project staff continuously strive to acquire:

1. Knowledge of American Indian values and culture and the ability to help students learn more about American Indian history and values.

2. An ability to encourage students' examination of personal identity and knowledge of American Indian values and issues, to promote positive self-concepts and awareness of personal, self-worth.

3. An awareness of a wide variety of American Indian community activities of interest to both the American Indian and non-Indian students.

4. The ability to appropriately encourage American Indian student's involvement and participation in university and community American Indian activities.

5. An interest in maintaining staff's personal involvement with appropriate university and community American Indian activities--assuming leadership positions according to one's own interest and time availability.

PROMOTING AMERICAN INDIAN STUDENTS' PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Initial Efforts

In the first years of the program, the vast majority of the graduate students were anxious about and questioned their ability to succeed in graduate school. Throughout their public school experience Indian students had repeatedly been encouraged to pursue a technical vocation rather than attend a college or university. The phrase "Indians are good with their hands but not with their heads" had been consistently reinforced. Many graduate students had been trained for multiple trades--they had worked as bookkeepers, butchers, auto mechanics, welders, secretaries, nurses aids, and paraprofessional alcoholism counselors, to name a few.

Another challenge graduate students faced was the expectation that they would complete each class in a sequential order. Their undergraduate work often showed a pattern of dropping classes toward the end of the term, with many students spending more than six years to complete a four-year degree.

A further challenge was the amount of time required to complete reading assignments for each course. With English a second language for many students, the reading assignments were initially formidable. Students often lacked experience in writing term papers. The project staff encouraged students to complete their written work early and have it reviewed by a staff person. Students were instructed in appropriate methods to improve the quality of their written work. Some students took undergraduate writing courses to improve their skills.

Still another challenge related to the way in which Indian graduate students' participation was actively solicited in class discussions. Many of the American Indian students had been taught to observe, not verbally participate, in new situations. When they were asked to comment in class about "Indian opinions" regarding specific topics, it was difficult for them to respond initially. Their culture had taught them to express their own opinions, not to speak for others. They often felt embarrassed and ill-prepared to respond to such questions. When they were able to discuss these cultural expectations within their classes, everyone profited. The American Indian students gradually began to offer information from the diverse opinions held by American Indians on many subjects. In this exchange students learned about opinions of other tribal groups. With over 500 different tribes in this country and multiple languages and cultural beliefs, it quickly became apparent why one person could not speak for all American Indian tribal groups. When students also understood the American Indian cultural value of respect for individuality, it became even more apparent that social workers with American Indian clientele must take into consideration the particular cultural and traditional beliefs of not only the tribal group, but each individual person within that tribal group--valuable knowledge for social work practice.

Research/Survey Responses of Graduates and Faculty

According to information received from American Indian graduate surveys, the most important factor which contributed to their achievement of the M.S.W. degree was the availability of financial assistance, followed closely by the personal and professional support of the American Indian project staff. Personal contacts, special advising, workshops and seminars were all viewed positively, as were academic laboratories and social activities for the students and their families.

Over two-thirds of the American Indian graduate students viewed their relationships with other Indian students as important to their achievement of the M.S.W. degree. Over 40% of the students also viewed their social activities and study groups with non-Indian students as important to their success.

One research project conducted at the Graduate School with minority and non-minority students asked students to identify factors which interfered with their personal adjustment to the Graduate School. American Indian students indicated that feelings of anxiety, particularly at the beginning of their graduate studies, interfered with their adjustment. While anxiety was an obstacle for other students, American Indian students experienced anxiety at higher levels and for longer periods of time. Other problems included adjusting to the differences between graduate expectations and undergraduate scholastic expectations. Family problems also created some tension, which interfered with the students' adjustment. Poor study habits, personal problems and extended family problems also interfered with American Indian students' adjustments at significantly higher levels than their non-minority colleagues. Housing and personal health problems were not seen as problematic for either group of graduate students.

SUMMARY

Many factors have contributed to the success of the University of Utah's American Indian Social Work Career Training Program. Essential components form the viewpoint of the authors and the graduates have been the commitment of the Graduate School faculty and administration; the efforts of the American Indian project staff thought the 19 years of the project's operation; and the continuing support of the University of Utah administration. This support has been essential to the implementation of the program and the graduation of each of the American Indian students participating in this program. Each of these students has commented upon the contributions of faculty members in supporting their academic program and encouraging completion of their graduate studies. Students reported receiving overt and subtle messages that they were welcomed, accepted, and valued as contributing members of the Graduate School program which helped them respond in a participatory and growth producing manner.

The American Indian students have also acknowledged the importance of the financial support they received. They specifically mention the National Institute of Mental Health, as well as the University of Utah, their tribes and other Indian organizations. Encouragement and tangible support from all social work faculty, Indian students, and non-Indian students were also identified as crucial variables. Specific American Indian project support services most often acknowledged as beneficial were student and family counseling; special workshops, seminars and laboratories; study groups; social and family activities; and attendance at workshops and conferences.

Feedback from both the graduates and project staff support the philosophy and goals of the American Indian Social Work Career Training Program. This philosophy advocates attention to all aspects of an American Indian student's life--academic, personal, family, social, financial and cultural--in order to promote their successful adjustment and educational achievement at the graduate level. When as many as 30 to 40 family members participate in one Indian student's graduation, there is occasion for communal celebration.

The experience of the University of Utah's Graduate School of Social Work has been that when American Indian students are provided opportunities to participate in sound educational programs with dedicated faculty, they are able to mobilize their personal and professional strengths to perform at high levels in both their academic work and in interpersonal relationships. In addition to the attainment of professional degrees, American Indian students have gained a greater appreciation of their own identification with "Indianness." With this identification has come a greater awareness of their personal and professional strengths and their ability to contribute to their people, country, and profession at high levels of competency.

FOUR

FINALE

The last paper given at the final panel of the Hofstra Conference delineated, in considerable detail, the history of affirmative action at American law schools, and offered suggestions for change. This paper, offered here in edited form, once again because of space considerations, tells the story of law schools. However, the words 'law school' could be changed to that of almost any other graduate or professional school, and the story would not be noticeably changed. Some might say that Anthony Scanlon's picture is pessimistic, but realistic may be the more apt word.

T. Berry Brazelton, the noted pediatrician, said in an article in the September 9, 1990 issue of The New York Times, that our leaders in government "seem able to focus only on danger from outside the country, not yet recognizing in any committed way that the greatest threat is from within...." Scanlon's paper defines these words.

We can take some comfort, however, in the fact that those of us who read these words, who participate in meetings like the Hofstra Minorities in Higher Education Conference, who in our work and daily lives attempt to eliminate inequality in educational opportunity, will stay in the fray. And our numbers are considerable. Sometimes we may become downhearted at the slow pace of change, but we believe that change is occurring, and that we will be part of it. And so, we continue.

THE CULTURE OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: THE LAW SCHOOL PERSPECTIVE

Anthony J. Scanlon

The Correctional Association and
The Osborne Association
New York City

Affirmative action at American law schools has been a failure. The percentage of minority students enrolled in law schools has stabilized or decreased after some early gains.[1] Unfortunately, legal education's decision to actively seek greater minority participation in law school and the legal profession occurred concurrently with explosive growth in the number of law school applicants.[2] Although there are several ways that these increases might have benefitted new groups among law school aspirants, the increase in applications was matched by the law schools' adoption of a selection system standard based on test and undergraduate backgrounds that few minority students could satisfy. Law schools which were not very selective before the boom years, adopted the language, if not always the reality, of selectivity and elitism which tended to make law admissions seem daunting. Furthermore, the desire to admit minority students made law schools, competitive by nature, place a higher value on institutional success than on an overall restructuring of the admissions process which might improve minority enrollments. Indeed, the essential element of the present culture of affirmative action which has led to the failure to improve minority admissions has been the peculiar notion that these programs had to conform to neat notions of predictability.

There is a very old conflict within legal education. Beginning with Benjamin Butler's effort to found a law school at New York University, before the Civil War,[3] along the lines espoused by Jacksonian Democrats, access to legal education and the advancement of the status of law schools have remained ideas which have been in conflict. Indeed, Butler and others failed to be able to merge the issues of "quality" with democratic access to the profession. It was only when those interested in opening the profession to new immigrants and the poor went outside the emerging law school establishment and founded separate law schools that democratic access to the legal profession become a reality.[4]

Thus, there was in legal education a long tradition of separateness between the academically elite law schools and those which would admit large numbers of economically deprived ethnic students. Prejudice against Catholics and Jews, as well as somewhat more subtle social obstacles could be overcome because these new immigrants founded their own law schools.[5] Indeed, one of the great triumphs of American democratic urges was the development of the urban Catholic law school under the auspices of the Society of Jesus, the Jesuits, and the Congregation of the Mission, the Vincentians.[6] The inability of ethnic Catholics and Jews to be admitted or to afford full-time legal education at the then leading law schools created a market for schools of high quality which would not exclude students simply because of their religion and which would adapt their programs to allow their students to support themselves by working while in school.

These early Catholic law schools, proficient in staffing liberal arts faculties, did not have the staff to conduct an American law school. As a result, there developed the somewhat anomalous situation where Protestant law faculties were engaged to teach at Catholic law schools which, in turn, enrolled large number of Jewish students.[7]

The concept of access for Black Americans to a legal education also began with a tradition of separateness, but with a very different and largely anti-democratic experience.[8] Although there had been separate Black institutions, the established legal principle of the "separate but equal" law school was born after the U.S. Supreme Court's 1938 decision in STATE OF MISSOURI EX REL GAINS V. CANADA.[9] Thus, under the protection of the Supreme Court decision, southern states were able to found law schools for Black students which were seriously under-funded. As the BROWN decision would show, the separate institutions could never be "equal".

It was the incredible vote by the American Bar Associations Board of Governors against integrating the ABA that prompted some members of the AALS to act to integrate law schools. Led by several members of the Yale faculty, the AALS debated a non-discriminatory standard for law school admissions in 1950. The ABA's actions forced the AALS to look at the separateness solution and begin to reject this as propagating an intolerably segregated bar. In an interesting foreshadowing of the BROWN decision, the AALS, unable to pass a stronger resolution, called for an end to segregation in legal education "at the earliest practical time."[10]

Legal educators were not focused upon the de facto segregation existing at elite northern institutions. These schools were willing to accept minority students but there was a sense that to be "qualified" a Black student had to be truly outstanding.[11] Nor was there very much discussion about what access to the profession beyond integration meant. At a 1959 conference on the future of legal education, six years after the BROWN decision, there was virtually no attention paid to the role legal education might play in promoting access to the legal profession.[12]

The early model of integrated legal education was a wonderfully idealized color-blind meritocracy.[13] But once social scientists began to gather data on minority lawyers, and the American Civil Liberties Union dropped its opposition to questions about an applicant's race, this simplistically idealized view was seriously challenged. The numbers were appalling. In 1970, 12% of the U.S. population was Black but less than 1% of lawyers were Black.[14] For other minority groups the situation was just as serious. In 1971 there were fewer than 100 Puerto Rican lawyers on the mainland and only 10 native American lawyers in the whole country![15] Regional deficiencies were more striking.[16] In Georgia there were 34 Black lawyers in a state with 1.2 million Blacks.

A lack of experience in having culturally diverse students led to the widespread assumption that short term preparation programs would adequately impact upon the stated goals of increased minority enrollments.[17] A certain amount of innocence was to be expected. N.Y.U. administrators, reflecting the public's perceptions about the sectional nature of the civil rights movement, fully expected its new minority population to be from the south. Indeed, although some southern Blacks did come as early as 1965, admissions barriers seemed to have been as real in New York. Once admissions officers were more sensitive to minority admissions, they found that most of their minority students came from their own geographic regions.[18]

Affirmative action programs were seen to be a simple adjunct to the admissions operation without much attention paid to the needs of minority students once enrolled.

At most institutions, minority students presented LSAT scores ranked below the entering majority students. While minority students had LSAT scores similar to majority students nationally, individual law schools concluded that they were less prepared because those minority students they were able to attract tended to be perceived as less able than the majority students.[19]

It was difficult to argue against the element of affirmative action which encouraged a shift upwards in minority students to schools to which they might not otherwise have been admitted.[20] Law schools across the nation had long stretched certain admissions standards for children of faculty, generous donors and, at state schools, for politically connected applicants.[21]

The problem the minority students had was that they were neither politically nor academically well-connected. Already told through the media and by fellow students that they were less able, they did not have the network or support of "preferentially" admitted majority students.

There was little imaginative recruiting at less prestigious or unfamiliar institutions. Sometimes, law schools would hire, at minimal salary, a recent law school grad to "recruit" minority schools. These well-meaning amateurs did not have the professional experience or resources to create and conduct a successful program over the period of time required to build an effective recruiting program.[22]

The recruiting element of the culture of law schools is particularly unfortunate. Most notably, there is a preference to obtain minorities already acculturated to the academic and economic aristocracy of the more competitive schools. These minority students, usually members of the Black middle class, represent such a small part of the minority community that a law school's minority enrollment can never reach the critical mass necessary to create the support network so available to majority students but largely disallowed to minority students.[23]

The basic philosophic tenet of a new culture of affirmative action would be that legal education has the major responsibility to insure access to the profession for those least likely to have the traditional academic or economic advantages typical of modern law students.

A Law School Admission Test should be one which is achievement-oriented and entirely cramable. Moreover, it should examine competence in subjects which legal education claims are important for legal studies.[24] If this means that the commercial test review industry expands even further, then this should be welcome.

The ABA and the AALS must insure that there are financial resources available for disadvantaged minority students. Legal education has already effectively protected its middle class constituencies at expensive private law schools through the LSAC's loan program. But students from backgrounds without a tradition of consumer debt are not likely to be able to benefit from such loan programs.

Nor, of course, does the ABA, AALS or even the LSAC have the resources to establish the necessary grant-in-aid programs to help attract minority students, But these national organizations can make this happen. The ABA and AALS have effectively compelled expenditures in a wide range of activities including millions for new law school buildings and somewhat lesser amounts for faculty salaries. With such involvement in pecuniary matters in the past, establishing thresholds of financial aid do not seem so radical.

Moreover, various organizations can help law schools raise funds for this purpose. Fund-raising is certainly an accepted activity for educational institutions, and law schools engaged in capital campaigns in the past few years can adapt some of these experiences to student-aid development campaigns.

Law schools will need support staff to reach these goals. This means that they must recognize, as undergraduate schools have, that the administrative and academic are not inimical to each other. Professional admissions persons, development offices and student counselors are indispensable to a new culture of affirmative action.

But, ultimately, law schools will have to organize themselves in a different manner if they want a culture of affirmative action at all. It is easy for legal educators to conduct conferences on affirmative action and to spin the wheels of bush-league recruitment exercises in the name of greater minority enrollment. A new culture of affirmative action which challenges the way law schools do business will be expensive and culturally disruptive. It will be particularly disconcerting for those in legal education who are resistant to any change in the means of access to the profession.

But it would be substantially more painful to the nation's future not to embrace a new culture of affirmative action. American democracy relies to such an extent on the system of laws which the legal profession represents, that it is hard to imagine legal education surviving without dramatic governmental interference, if de facto segregation remains a hallmark of American legal education.

REFERENCES

1. In 1971-1972, the total minority enrollment was 5,568 out of 94,468. With enrollment at 123,277 minorities are still just 12,550. There was little growth in the 1980's, from 11,134 to the present figures. Indeed, the enrollment of Black students fell from 6,051.5 to 5,894. See: A Review of Legal Education in the United States 67-68 (ABA: 1986)

2. Although there was some indication that the number of applicants would decline, the boom years seem to be continuing. See: Applicants Up: Who are These People, Law Service Reports, Apr.-May 1988 at 1. col. 2.

3. 1. See: THE LAW SCHOOL PAPERS OF BENJAMIN F. POWERS (Ronald L. Brown, ed, 1988).

4. Although much has been written on the issue, nothing surpasses Alfred Z. Reed's seminal work, TRAINING FOR THE PUBLIC PROFESSIONAL OF THE LAW (New York, 1921). Reed, who was not a lawyer, saw and highlighted the connection between access to the profession and access to the democratic process. The debate about democracy in American Legal education, it may be noted, occurred at the same time that many European political thinkers were disparaging the very concept of democracy as the extreme right was gaining strength.

5. For a general overview of the history of Catholic law schools see: Nelson, God and Man in the Catholic Law School, 26 CATH. Law 127 (1981).

6. See: Kelly, De Paul University College of Law, 6 CATH. LAW. 127 (1960), Paple, The Law School of Loyola University, New Orleans, 5 CATH. LAW. 218 (1959), Seitz, Marquette Law School-Fifty Years of Service in the Middle West, 3 CATH. LAW 331 (1957), Lucey, S.H., The Story of Georgetown Law School, 3 CATH. LAW. 130 (1957), McKenny, Santa Clara University College of Law, 5 CATH. LAW. 61 (1959) and Miller, The Law School of the Catholic University of America, 4 CATH. LAW. 333 (1958).

7. Powers, A HISTORY OF CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 249 (1958).

8. See: Harris, The New Members of the Law Teaching Profession in America, 4 J. Legal Educ. 436, 436 (1952).

9. 305 U.S. 337, 59 S. Ct. 232, 83 L. Ed. 208.

10. AALS Proc. 42 (1950).

11. There was a general consensus that Black students admitted to formerly segregated law schools be "carefully selected negroes." See: AALS Proc. 86 (1956). Indeed it was thought important to note at the time that the editor-in-chief of the 1961-1963 law review at North Carolina was Black. See: Report of the Committee on Racial Discrimination, AALS Proc. 195, 195 (1962).

12. McGee, Univiersities, Law Schools, Communities: Learning or Service or Learning and Service? 22 J. Legal Educ. 37 44 n. 30 (1969).

13. Summer, Preferential Admissions: An Unreal Solution to a Real Problem, 2 Tol. L. Rev. 377, 388 (1970).

14. Fordham, News of the Association 1963-1970, 24 J. Legal Educ. 94, 96 (1971).

15. Cabranes, Careers in the Law for Minorities: A Puerto Ricans Perspective on Recent Developments in Legal Education 24 J. Legal Educ. 447, 451 (1973).

16. O'Neil, Supra note 26 at 295.

17. Huff, The Propriety of Preparatory Programs for Minority Students, 2 Tol. L. Rev. 747, 748 (1970).

18. Hughes, Mckay and Winograd, The Disadvantaged Student and Preparation for Legal Education: The NYU Experience, 2 Tol. L. Rev. 701, 709 (1970).

19. Rosen, Equalizing Access to Legal Education: Special Programs for Law Students Who Are Not Admissible By Traditional Criteria, 2 Tol. L. R. 321, 328 (1970).

20. This phenomena was documented very early. See: 1971 Survey of Minority Students, 24 J. Legal Education 487 (1972).

21. R. O'Neil, Racial Preferences and Higher Education: The Larger Context, 60 Va. L. Rev. 925, 926 (1974).

22. The "quick fix" syndrome was a danger from the very beginning. See: E.L. Carl, The Shortage of Negro Lawyers: Plualistic Legal Education and Legal Services for the Poor, 20 J. Legal Educ. 21, 26, (1967).

23. Bell, Law School Exams and Minority-Group Students, 7 Black L. J. 304, 307 (1981) and D.A. Bell, Black Students in White Law Schools: The Ordeal and the Opportunity, 2 Tol. L. R. 539 550 (1970).

24. Testimony of William J. Bennett, Secretary of Education, before the Committee of Labor and Human Resources, Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and the Humanities. United States Senate, Jan. 18, 1986.

MINORITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

March 9, 10, 11, 1989

Sanford Hammer Provost and Dean of Faculties	Conference Co-Director
Lois A. Beilin Dean, School of Education	Conference Co-Director
Alexej Ugrinski Hofstra Cultural Center	Conference Co-Coordinator
Laura Jeanne Tringone Hofstra Cultural Center	Conference Co-Coordinator

MINORITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

Terry L. Baker
Associate Dean
School of Education

Herman A. Berliner
Dean, School of Business

David Christman
Dean, New College

Sylvia Federici
New College

John Guthman
Counseling Center

Deanna L. Hunter
Assistant Dean
University Advisement

Lynette James
Department of
Business Law

Cheryl R. Lehman
Department of Accounting

Edward A. Lynch
Assistant Dean of Students
& Director of Student
Activities

Jacquelyn McLendon
Department of English

Maureen O. Murphy
Dean of Students

Natalie A. Naylor
Director, Long Island
Studies Institute
Foundations of Education
& New College

James Neelankavil
Associate Dean
School of Business

Mercedes M. de Rodriguez
Department of Spanish

Frank W. Smith
Assistant Dean &
Executive Director, NOAH

Jeannine Swift
Associate Dean
Hofstra College of
Liberal Arts & Sciences

Felicita R. Torres
Director, Upward Bound
Program

John D. VanBuren
Department of CPRE

Graydon Vanderbilt
Assistant Dean of
International Students

Robert C. Vogt
Dean, Hofstra College of
Liberal Arts & Sciences

Harold E. Yuker
Mervyn L. Schloss
Distinguished Professor
of Psychology

STUDENT PARTICIPANTS

Jean Adams
Hofstra University

Wilma Arguinzoni
Bunker Hill Community College

Darren Alton Armstrong
Fresno City College

Everett Chavez
University of New Mexico

Stephen Gilmore
Miami-Dade Community College

Hester Herring
Hofstra University

Lennox Joseph
University of the Virgin Islands

Kang-Ying King
University of Massachusetts

Howard Marbury
Hofstra University

Abdul Macan-Marker
Hofstra University

Ronald Mills
Frostburg State University

George Robles
Hofstra University

Juanita Salazar
College of Idaho

Vanessa Santiago
Hofstra University

Joseph Sparacio
Hofstra University

Elizabeth Thompson
California State University

Youlin Tsai
Hofstra University

Mark Walters
Hofstra University

Vesta Wilds
Seton Hill College

Michele Worthy
Hofstra University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1989

8:00 A.M. - 5:00 p.m.	**Conference Registration** **Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library** **Tenth Floor, South Campus**
9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.	**Hofstra Cultural Center Lecture Hall** **Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library** **First Floor, South Campus**
	CONFERENCE OPENING
Greetings:	**James M. Shuart** President, Hofstra University
Introduction:	**Sanford Hammer** Provost and Dean of Faculties Conference Co-Director
Keynote Address:	**Alexander W. Astin** Professor and Director, Higher Education Research Institute University of California, Los Angeles Los Angeles, CA "Excellence and Equity in the Education of Minority Students"
10:30 a.m. -12:00 p.m.	**Hofstra Cultural Center Lecture Hall** **Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library** **First Floor, South Campus**
Panel A	Moderator: **Andrew J. Grant** Director of Grants Development Hofstra University "Cultural Factors Differentiating Academically Unsuccessful Students, Academically Successful Students, and Faculty" **Paula Chu-Richardson** Associate Dean of Students Trinity College Hartford. CT "Puerto Rico: The Forgotten Region of American Higher Education" **Estela Lopez** Vice President for Academic Affairs; and **Elizabeth Scalley** Director, The Research Institute Inter American University of Puerto Rico San Juan, PR

Panel B (continued)

"Black College Students Satisfaction with
Faculty, Peers and Academic Support Programs"
Millie Louise Russell
Assistant to the Vice President,
Office of Minority Affairs
University of Washington
Seattle, WA

3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Hofstra Cultural Center Lecture Hall
Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library
First Floor, South Campus

Introduction:

Sylvia J. Giallombardo
Associate Provost for Academic Affairs
Hofstra University

Special Speaker:

Anne S. Pruitt
Professor of Educational Policy and Leadership
Director, Center for Teaching Excellence
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

"In Pursuit of Equality in Higher Education"

4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Student Center Theater, North Campus

Panel C

ATHLETICS AND ACADEMICS

Moderator: Jim Garvey
Director of Athletics
Hofstra University

Freeman McNeil
New York Jets

Roscoe Brown
President, Bronx Community College/CUNY
Bronx, NY

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1989

4:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

Hofstra Cultural Center Lecture Hall
Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library
First Floor, South Campus

Panel D

Moderator: **Natalie A. Naylor**
Director, Long Island
Studies Institute
Foundation of Education &
New College
Hofstra University

"An Endangered Species in Higher Education: Administrative Perceptions, Opinions and Suggestions"
Louise M. Tomlinson
Division of Developmental Studies
University of Georgia
Athens, GA

"Administrative Skills for Women in Higher Education"
Daisy P. Reed, Doris W. Busby and Cynthia Bryant
School of Education
Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, VA

"Black African Faculty and Minority Students in Traditionally White Institutions"
Godwin Okebaram Uwah
Department of Languages
College of Charleston
Charleston, SC

"Native American Indian Students' Perceptions"
Ben Chavis
American Indian Studies Department
San Francisco State University
San Francisco, CA

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1989

6:00 p.m.	**Dining Rooms A,B, and C** **North Campus**
	CONFERENCE BANQUET AND CASH BAR
Presiding:	**James M. Shuart** President, Hofstra University
Greetings:	**Lois A. Beilin** Dean, School of Education Conference Co-Director

FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 1989

8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Conference Registration
Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library
Tenth Floor, South Campus

8:30 p.m. - 10:30 p.m.

Hofstra Cultural Center Lecture Hall
Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library
First Floor, South Campus

Panel E

Moderator: **James Neelankavil**
Associate Dean, School of Business
Hofstra University

"The Relationship Between Attitude Toward Science, Science Self-Concept and Other Variables of Occupational Choice to the Science Career Choice of Black College Students"
Charles R. Salters
School of Education
Morgan State University
Baltimore, MD

"Engineering Education for Minority Students: A Status Report"
Howard G. Adams
Executive Director
National Consortium for Graduate Degrees for Minorities in Engineering, Inc.
Notre Dame, IN

"An Effective American Indian Social Work Recruitment and Retention Program"
E. Daniel Edwards
Professor and Director,
American Indian Social Work Program
Director, Native American Indian Studies; and
Margie Egbert-Edwards
Graduate School of Social Work
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT

"Minorities in Management: A Graduate Management Challenge"
Susan M. McTiernan
Director, M.B.A. Programs
Hofstra University
Dan Robertson
Associate Dean for Academic Programs
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX

Friday, March 10, 1989

10:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.	**Hofstra Cultural Center Lecture Hall** **Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library** **First Floor, South Campus**
Introduction:	**Robert C. Vogt** Dean, Hofstra College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Hofstra University
Special Speaker:	**Harold L. Hodgkinson** Senior Fellow The Institute for Educational Leadership Washington D.C. "Demographic Imperatives for the Future"
11:30 a.m. - 1:30 p.m.	**Hofstra Cultural Center Lecture Hall** **Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library** **First Floor, South Campus**
Panel F	Moderator: **David Christman** Dean, New College Hofstra University
	"Strategies to Get More American Indian Women in Higher Education" **Susan Peterson** Department of Psychology Texas State Technical Institute Harlingen, TX
	"Native Indians in Teacher Education: Socio-Psychological (OPI) Norms for a Sample of Northwest Freshmen" **David Whittaker** School of Education University of British Columbia Vancouver, B.C.
	"Tribal Cooperation in Educational Opportunities for Native Americans: Twenty Years of St. Regis Mohawk-St. Lawrence University Association" **Robert N. Wells, Jr.** Department of Government and Coordinator, Native American Programs; and **Denise White** Assistant Director of Admissions and Financial Aid St. Lawrence University Canton, NY

Friday, March 10, 1989

Panel F (continued)	"The Four Year Community College: Tribal College - Some Lessons in Success for Indian Students in College" **Lowell Amiotte** President; and **Tom Allen** Director Allen Director, Institutional Development Oglala Lakota College Kyle, SD
1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.	**LUNCH, Student Center Cafe** **North Campus**

Friday, March 10, 1989

2:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

Hofstra Cultural Center Lecture Hall
Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library
First Floor, South, Campus

Panel G.

Minority Student Forum:
Student Issues in Higher Education

Moderator: **Frank W. Smith**
Assistant Dean and Executive
Director
NOAH
Hofstra University

William Arguinzoni
Bunker Hill Community College
Boston, MA

Darren Alton Armstrong
Fresno City College
Frenso, CA

Everett Chavez
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM

Stephen Gilmore
Miami-Dade Community College
Miami, FL

Lennox Joseph
University of the Virgin Island
Saint Thomas, VI

Kang-Ying King
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA

Howard Marbury
Hofstra University

Ronald A. Mills
Frostburg State University
Frostburg, MD

Juanita Salazar
College of Idaho
Caldwell, ID

Elizabeth Thompson
California State University
Long Beach, CA

Vesta Wilds
Seton Hill College
Greensburg, PA

We gratefully acknowledge the support of the

Lilly Endowment, Inc.
Indianapolis, IN

for sponsorship of eight visiting minority students

and the

Olsten Corporation
Westbury, NY

for sponsorship of two visiting minority students

Friday, March 10, 1989

4:30p.m. - 5:30 p.m.	**Hofstra Cultural Center Lecture Hall** **Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library** **First Floor, South Campus**
Introduction:	**Michael Barnes** Department of Psychology Hofstra University
Special Speaker:	**Edmund Gordon** John M. Musser Professor of Psychology Yale University New Haven, CT "Hegemonic Cultures and Truncated Cultures and Knowledge"

SATURDAY, MARCH 11, 1989

8:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	**Conference Registration** **Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library** **Tenth Floor, South Campus**

9:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	**Hofstra Cultural Center Lecture Hall** **Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library** **First Floor, South Campus**
Panel H	Moderator: **Cheryl R. Lehman** Department of Accounting Hofstra University
	"The American Indian Program Harvard Graduate School of Education 1970-1989" **Bette Haskins** Director, American Indian Program Harvard University Cambridge, MA
	"Problems and Solutions in Minority Training for Careers in Public Management" **Harry Weiner** Consultant, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation New York, NY
	"Status of Hispanic Women in Academia" **Sarah Nieves-Squires** Health Professions Program Harvard University Cambridge, MA
	"Strategies for the Recruitment of Minority Group Students to Teacher Education" **Howard D. Hill** Director, Chapter Programs Phi Delta Kappa Bloomington, IN

SATURDAY, MARCH 11, 1989

11:00a.m. - 12:30 p.m.	**Hofstra Cultural Center Lecture Hall** **Joan and Donald, E. Axinn Library** **First Floor, South Campus**
Panel I	Moderator: **Deanna L. Hunter** Assistant Dean, University Advisement Hofstra University "Perceptions and Experiences of Minority Students" **Lynda F. Dickson** Department of Sociology University of Colorado at Colorado Springs Colorado Springs, CO "Design of Graduate Research Mentorship Programs" **Richard P. Durán, James Valadez and Lydia Mathews** School of Education University of California, Santa Barbara Santa Barbara, CA "The Bane of Black Student Retention: Learned Helplessness" **Earl M. Washington** Assistant Dean, The College of Arts and Sciences Western Michigan University Kalamazoo, MI
12:30 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.	**LUNCH, Student Center Café** **North Campus**

SATURDAY, MARCH 11, 1989

1:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Hofstra Cultural Center Lecture Hall
Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library
First Floor, South Campus

Panel J

Moderator: **Jacquelyn McLendon**
Department of English
Hofstra University

"Broadening Horizons for Minority Youngsters: With Particular Emphasis on Vicarious and Actual Experiences to Provide Entry to College"
Mary Ann W. Franklin
Assistant to the Dean
Southern University at New Orleans
New Orleans, LA

"A Comprehensive Model to Enhance the Academic Achievement of Minority Students Attending Predominantly White Colleges/Universities"
LaVerne L. Baker
Department of Communicative Disorders
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Lafayette, LA

"Minority Student Recruitment: A Partnership Between College and Secondary Schools"
James B. Evers, Jr.
Vice President for Student Affairs
Dillard University
New Orleans, LA

SATURDAY MARCH 11, 1989

3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

Hofstra Cultural Center Lecture Hall
Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library
First Floor, South Campus

Panel K

Moderator: **Mercedes M. de Rodriguez**
Department of Spanish
Hofstra University

"Social Welfare Needs of African-Americans as Factors in Retention"
Barbara W. Emerson
Director, SEEK Program
Queens College/CUNY
Flushing, NY

"An Ecological Analysis of the Experiences of Black Graduate Students"
Darlene C. DeFour
Department of Psychology
Hunter College/CUNY
New York, NY

"The Culture of Affirmative Action"
Anthony J. Scanlon
Correctional Association of New York
New York, NY

4:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.

Hofstra Cultural Center Gallery
Joan and Donald E. Axinn Library
Tenth Floor, South Campus

FAREWELL RECEPTION

HOFSTRA
UNIVERSITY
HEMPSTEAD, NEW YORK 11550